

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HUMAN RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, almost everywhere we look in the world today, we see the devastating effects of the Reagan administration's deemphasis of human rights. In South Africa, the Philippines, El Salvador, Chile, Guatemala, and even Poland and the Soviet Union, the administration's approach of placing human rights near the bottom of the list of foreign policy priorities has helped to worsen the plight of people in those nations.

While I was pleased by the recent release of a comprehensive human rights report by the State Department, I was disturbed by some of its findings. For example, while the State Department report recognizes the incidence of torture and murder of innocent civilians in El Salvador, it seems to downplay the extent to which government forces are responsible for these atrocities.

In its 1981 "Report on Human Rights in Latin America," the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, a prestigious nonprofit organization which monitors human rights in the Western Hemisphere, named El Salvador and Guatemala as the worst human rights violators in the hemisphere. With U.S. military aid to El Salvador increasing, and the possibility of U.S. armed intervention looming ominously on the horizon, I feel it is important for us to put into perspective exactly what type of regime we are supporting.

I am inserting for the RECORD the Council's summary of the human rights situation in Latin America for 1981, along with the specific country reports for El Salvador and Guatemala. I urge my colleagues to examine these reports, in hopes that the good work of the Council in revealing human rights violations in Latin America, and in El Salvador and Guatemala in particular, may have a positive impact on U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA—1981
ANNUAL REPORT

(Prepared by the Council on Hemispheric Affairs)

The observance of human rights is particularly central to the political life of Latin America. The region has historically suffered a high incidence of authoritarian government, weak political traditions and

strong military establishments which characteristically restrict the personal and political freedom of the citizenry and violate human rights that are universally recognized as inalienable. Even given the region's dreary history in this respect, the calendar year 1981 was marked by an alarming deterioration of human rights in the Western Hemisphere, as both the number and the seriousness of the abuses committed by such regimes rose dramatically.

This report presents a brief overview of the status of human rights in most Latin American nations during the past year, commenting on important social, political and military factors germane to the respect or disrespect of basic constitutional guarantees of life, liberty and political freedom. The report was compiled in the last six months by this organization's research staff, and draws on a wide variety of domestic and international sources for its information. Because of restrictions imposed by limited space and a lack of extensive on-site investigations, it does not attempt to provide an exhaustive statistical analysis of human rights violations in any given nation. Rather, it seeks to give the reader a balanced and informative summary of the status of human rights in Latin America, and to describe important developments in the past year.

(The Council on Hemispheric Affairs also drafts more extensive and detailed country-by-country studies of human rights which will be issued over the first half of 1982.)

INTRODUCTION

Basic civil liberties, including the right to life, liberty, and the freedom of personal and political expression, suffered a drastic setback in 1981. In more than a dozen regional nations, even the most fundamental rights—life and the inviolability of the person—were violated by the government-condoned practice of harassing, torturing and murdering political opponents of those in power. In six other nations, personal and political freedoms were restricted to varying extents by government actions.

These reverses were directly linked to policies adopted by President Reagan, particularly the "quiet diplomacy" approach to human rights issues. Seemingly obsessed with the East-West dimension of hemispheric relations, the Reagan administration substituted militaristic, security-related considerations for a genuine concern for human life, with a catastrophic effect on the lives of Latin Americans. Candidate Reagan berated the Carter human rights policy for its inconsistency and alleged bias against pro-U.S. authoritarian regimes, but his own policy suffers from the same double standard in reverse. He properly attacks human rights violations in Poland as well as lesser misdeeds in some Latin American leftist states while remaining silent in the face of crimes by right-wing regimes that cry out for condemnation.

In its first six months in office, the new administration completely reversed the Carter administration's human rights policy that had, in a surprisingly short time, reversed this nation's reputation as the world's bully. The Carter human rights policy won recognition around the world for

representing the best rather than the worst of U.S. ideals. More than that, it worked in Latin America as nation after nation responded to the moral and material pressure by lessening, or at least pretending to lessen, pulling out the fingernails of its own citizens.

Citing the need to protect Latin America from presumed communist insurgency, Reagan has allied the U.S. with almost all of the most violent regimes in the hemisphere. In doing so, he has sanctioned atrocities and human rights abuses by providing these governments with essentially unconditional support. In spite of its spirited opposition to big government, the Reagan presidency quickly arrayed itself with governments which are almost totalitarian in their control over every aspect of society.

The Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) found that serious human rights violations increased to the point of being a grave cause for alarm in at least twelve nations during 1981. In a number of other countries, previously acceptable human rights records were marred by abuses which slipped them into the "mixed" category. Only a handful of nations, according to COHA's findings, maintained good records or significantly improved their practices during the past twelve months.

Central America, a focus of international concern over human rights in 1980, continued to be the site of the most serious and widespread violations, as the civil violence wracking El Salvador and Guatemala escalated to unprecedented levels. Named by COHA last year as the hemisphere's worst violators of human rights, the governments of these two nations intensified their violent policies and in 1981 together accounted for 25,000 to 30,000 civilian deaths—nearly double the 1980 total, and far outnumbering the number of victims of political violence in the whole of Latin America.

A comparable death toll in the United States would have claimed well over 500,000 lives.

As a consequence, Guatemala and El Salvador have been selected in 1981 as the hemisphere's worst human rights violators for the second consecutive year.

Colombia, at present led by a nominally democratic government, suffered one of the most precipitous declines in the respect for human rights in 1981. The increasing influence of the Colombian military in government affairs, and the inherent mediocrity and opportunism of the two main political parties, gave cause for concern that the situation may deteriorate further in 1982. COHA has called for increased international attention to be focused on Colombia's human rights practices during the coming year.

The Southern Cone nations of Argentina, Chile and Uruguay, where international pressure and the Carter human rights policy were most successful in winning a reduction of abuses during the late 1970's once again reverted to their previous patterns of repression, and renewed efforts to polish their tarnished international image by words rather than deeds.

The nations under leftist or revolutionary socialist rule in Latin America, placed in a

separate and more sinister category by the Reagan administration's ideological fervor, actually compiled a mixed human rights record. Cuba, and Grenada, to a varying extent, placed restrictions on the political and personal expression of their citizens but managed to avoid the brutal torture and murder of political opponents which has made right-wing Latin American regimes infamous. Their status has remained the same—negative on human rights, but no significant deterioration. Nicaragua, which in terms of human rights witnessed a steady decline in its commitment to pluralism through much of the year, now seems to have pulled itself back and there are hopeful signs that government authorities are again aiming for a relatively open society.

What follows is a country-by-country review of the 1981 human rights situation in Latin America:

CENTRAL AMERICA

El Salvador

The massive level of human rights abuses in El Salvador during 1980 escalated to still more tragic levels in 1981, as the social fabric of the nation disintegrated under the pressure of civil conflict and as the government's repressive tactics became institutionalized. More than 12,000 civilians were killed in 1981, according to the Legal Aid Office of the San Salvador Archdiocese, which compiled testimonies from relatives and friends of victims. Because many murders go unreported (due to survivor's fears of retribution), the actual number of victims is believed to be higher. Some estimates have placed the overall death toll for this year as high as 17,000. Almost all sources agree that the vast majority of these killings are attributable to the combined armed forces (Army, Treasury Police, National Guard, and National Police) and to right-wing paramilitary organizations acting with the armed forces' complicity.

While managing to survive in office, President Jose Napoleon Duarte has had virtually no success in limiting the abuses committed by a substantial sector of the armed forces or in placing legal limitations on the activities of several right-wing paramilitary organizations. His inability to prosecute the detained National Guard members implicated in the murder of four U.S. religious women a year ago, and to provide for even minimal security for visiting foreigners, let alone moderate local political leaders, is convincing evidence that while he may reign, he certainly doesn't rule. In effect, Duarte is little more than a figure head president who agilely serves two often disparate masters: Washington and his own security forces.

The daily violence in the countryside has reached such proportions that most international observers, as well as some Salvadorans and U.S. officials, now agree that the plans to hold elections in March 1982 are no longer feasible because of the danger to candidates who dare to campaign and the restrictions imposed on the electoral process by the Duarte government.

One human rights problem that is growing more serious every day, is the plight of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have been forced to leave their homes due to the violence. The U.N. High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) estimated in August that as many as 300,000 Salvadorans have been displaced as a result of the country's conflict, and that 100,000 more have fled to neighboring Honduras and Guatemala for safety.

Living conditions for these refugees are often subhuman. Their presence has already overtaken the limited resources of local centers to support them. Beyond the threat of starvation, however, the refugees face a continued danger from the Salvadoran armed forces and paramilitary, which carry on a campaign of harassment and terror against refugee encampments.

There have been numerous documented cases of collaboration between Honduran and Salvadoran military units in which hundreds of refugees—mostly women, small children, and the elderly—have been gunned down while attempting to flee the advance of Salvadoran troops. Reports from the Honduran border area by an independent U.S. fact-finding mission in November indicated that Salvadoran paramilitary squads cross freely into Honduran territory to randomly harass, kidnap and murder nationals living in camps along the border.

The Duarte government has failed not only in its feeble attempts to bring to justice the military officials responsible for the murder of four U.S. Catholic missionaries, but has also failed to prosecute the two men believed guilty of the murders of two U.S. agrarian reform advisers the following month, as well as establish the fate of a free-lance U.S. journalist who disappeared from his hotel around the same time. Despite the evidence of Salvadoran military complicity in these and other acts of terrorism against U.S. citizens, the Reagan administration has pushed for increased levels of U.S. assistance to the Salvadoran armed forces during 1982, virtually guaranteeing that the levels of violence and abuse by the Salvadoran authorities will climb still higher.

Guatemala

Guatemala is the site of the most serious decline in the human rights situation in all of Latin America. Since the CIA orchestrated a military coup which deposed Guatemala's last reform-minded government in 1954, this Central American nation has been ruled by a series of military or military-controlled regimes with a reputation for unusual brutality. The year 1981 marked a new high in the level of government-sponsored murder, torture and repression that is shocking even for this violence-prone nation.

The latest available, if difficult to establish, estimates indicate that at least 9,000—and possibly as many as 12,000—civilians have been killed since January, with the average daily death toll having risen well above fifty in the last few months. Even supporters of the Guatemalan regime do not deny that the overwhelming majority of civilian deaths are attributable either to the armed forces or to secret "death squads," financed by wealthy industrialists and owners of agricultural estates, which are coordinated by top military officials from a room in an annex to the Presidential Palace.

Journalists, Indian peasants, labor leaders, students, teachers, centrist politicians, and professionals are the primary targets of what can only be described as a government extermination campaign against the nation's moderate alternative. Only a tiny percentage of those killed were in any way associated with Guatemala's four main guerrilla organizations; most sources indicate that there are about 3,000 guerrillas active in the country—or less than one-third of the minimum number of civilians killed in 1981 alone.

Increasing levels of government repression in the countryside, however, have only

made it easier for guerrilla organizations to attract recruits from among Guatemala's large and traditionally politically inert, Indian population. COHA has received a constant flow of information throughout the year from a variety of official sources, and from cable traffic originating in several Western embassies in Guatemala City, of government counterinsurgency—or "search and destroy" missions—in rural areas which resulted in massacres of entire villages.

In February, for example, 169 peasant deaths at the hands of security forces were confirmed in the department of Chimaltenango; it is believed that many more were actually killed. From June 16 to 19, fifty villagers from El Arbolito in the northern department of El Peten were killed, and hundreds more fled across the border into Mexico. On July 19, government troops killed between 150 and 300 villagers at Coya in Huehuetenango. In a number of these incidents, U.S.-supplied helicopters were used to bomb and strafe communities whose misfortune was to be situated in areas where guerrillas were active.

Reagan administration actions have provided the Guatemalan government and right-wing death squads with a virtual endorsement of their tactics. The suspension of U.S. military assistance imposed during the Carter years is being eroded—a clear violation of congressional intent—and administration officials have repeatedly spoken of the need to help Guatemala combat "an international communist conspiracy."

A possible explanation for the Reagan administration's blind eye towards the most blatant case of human rights violations in the hemisphere is that a number of top administration officials, including Deputy White House Chief of Staff Michael Deaver, Ambassador-at-Large Vernon Walters, and State Department Special Consultant Lt. Gen. Gordon Sumner (Ret.), have had close personal and business ties with many of the Guatemalan officers responsible for the abuses. It is also widely alleged that the Reagan presidential campaign was the beneficiary of illicit contributions from Guatemalan businessmen and politicians anxious to have a friend in the White House. ●

TRIBUTE TO JULIETTE E. ABRAHAM

HON. JIM DUNN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan, the Republican Party, and our entire Nation has lost an outstanding individual. Julie Abraham of East Lansing, Mich. died January 25, 1982, at the age of 63. Her willingness to volunteer and her service not only to her political party, but to all human beings, can serve as an example to Americans everywhere. I wish the House of Representatives to take special note on this occasion.

At the time of her death, Julie Abraham was serving as Michigan's Sixth Congressional District Republican chairman, a title she retained since 1975. She also was membership chair-

man of the Ingham County Republican Party, a position she held since 1975 and prior to that from 1969 to 1973. She also served as a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1972 and 1976. A dedicated volunteer, her loyalty was displayed time and again by the long hours of work she put forth to accomplish any task, no matter how difficult or tiring. Her knowledge and capabilities gave her the power to be a true leader.

But to suggest that her passing on will be a loss for only her party would be a mistake. Foremost an American, she was a great believer in democratic ideals and our political process. She was particularly active with younger Americans, and encouraged all youths to take an active role in the Nation's decisionmaking process. All who knew her selfless charity and kindness will also recognize the void her death has left us. To describe an individual as a "special person" in these times has become an overworked cliché. But there is no other way to refer to Julie Abraham.

Her loyalty, devotion, and willingness to help others, demonstrated each day, command our respect. She was truly a credit to her community and the Nation. To her husband, Eddie, and her entire family, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy.●

MUSHROOM LABELING

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1982, I introduced two companion bills, H.R. 5353 and H.R. 5354, that will provide information to consumers about the origin of processed mushrooms they buy.

H.R. 5354 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to require that containers of imported preserved mushrooms disclose on their labels, in English, the country in which the mushrooms were grown. Current law requires only that the label identify the country which last processed the mushrooms. This situation can be most misleading to the consumer, who may not know that the processed mushrooms offered for sale were actually grown in a country other than the one that provided the final processing before importation to the United States.

H.R. 5353 amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that containers of mushrooms not grown within the United States disclose on their labels the country in which the mushrooms were grown. H.R. 5353 is intended to address the labeling of mushrooms moving in interstate commerce and would re-

quire American producers to comply with its terms.

H.R. 5354 addresses the marking of containers of mushrooms entering the United States from foreign sources.

In my view, the American consumer has a right to know what he or she is buying. We have a right to know whether the products offered to us are grown by American farmers who are subject to inspections and sanitation requirements of the highest stringency. It is well known that the procedures in effect in many parts of the world would not pass muster in this country. It is a plain fact that overseas farming operations can operate at lower cost than their American counterparts, if the foreign operators pay little or nothing to their workers, or use methods or chemicals that would be outlawed here.

Other economic problems confront the American mushroom grower. The principal threat looming on the horizon is the ability and willingness of the People's Republic of China to surge and dump their canned mushrooms in our processed mushroom market, thereby destroying the domestic producer. The Chinese motivation is plain: that country desperately needs hard currency to pay its debts and buy foreign-made products. To get this currency, the Chinese are willing to sell below their costs in order to force out their competition, first the other foreign producers, and then the American producers.

The International Trade Commission has conducted more than one investigation into the plight of the American mushroom industry. In August 1980, the ITC ruled that imported mushrooms were entering the United States at such a rate as to be a "substantial cause of serious injury" to the American mushroom industry. Subsequently, a series of tariffs were imposed in order to stem this unprecedented assault on our domestic growers.

Today, Mr. Speaker, that assault continues, and it comes primarily from the People's Republic of China.

During the third quarter of 1981, China increased its share of the total imports to the United States by nearly 300 percent over the same quarter of the previous year. In 1978, China exported only a negligible number of mushrooms to the United States. During the 1980 marketing year, it exported over 20 million pounds, and in so doing, it became the largest single supplier of imported mushrooms to our country.

Should this trend continue, the American mushroom industry will undoubtedly become irreparably damaged while foreign competition is also reduced. The possibility of a single supply source is not farfetched. An entire American industry is threatened by attack from a nonmarket

economy industry that has our farmers in its sights.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the American consumer learns the truth, he will support his local mushroom farmer. What I ask Congress to enact is merely a requirement for truth in labeling. If the consumer has the facts, he can make his own choice. I urge the support of my colleagues for these bills.●

DEBORAH BAKER NAMED SOUTH CAROLINA JUNIOR MISS

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here in the Halls of Congress, in essence, is preparing the way for future generations of Americans. Youth is the promise of tomorrow. Youth is, and always will be, the greatest resource our Nation possesses. It is with pride that the Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina will be represented throughout South Carolina and many parts of the Nation by a young and vivacious high school senior from my hometown of Bennettsville. Miss Deborah Till Baker was recently selected as South Carolina's Junior Miss. In honor of that occasion, I would like to present the following news account for consideration and ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish Miss Baker much success as she competes in America's Junior Miss competition in Mobile, Ala., this summer.

(From the Marlboro Herald-Advocate, Dec. 7, 1981)

DEBORAH BAKER NAMED SC JUNIOR MISS

Miss Deborah Till Baker, 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene H. Baker Jr. of Bennettsville and the late Joanne Kinney Baker, was selected South Carolina Junior Miss in Sumter Saturday night. She is the granddaughter of Mrs. John F. Kinney of Bennettsville and the late Judge Kinney.

The Bennettsville High School senior represented Marlboro County in the program. Deborah is senior class vice president, a member of the Beta Club, and was elected BHS Homecoming Queen last month. She is also a former Miss Marlboro Academy.

Deborah vied for the title with 57 other high school senior Junior Misses from across the state. During the week-long competition her host family was Mr. and Mrs. Buddy Sharpe of Sumter.

The Junior Miss Scholarship Program is sponsored by local sponsors and by national sponsors. Chart House Inc., Coca-Cola USA, Clairol, Kraft Foods and Simplicity Patterns.

On Wednesday Deborah was interviewed by the judges. On Thursday and Friday nights, she competed in poise and appearance, creative and performing arts, and physical fitness preliminaries.

Deborah won the physical fitness preliminary Friday night and was the \$300-scholarship winner for overall poise and appearance.

Each contestant's transcript of grades, scores and honors was evaluated by a qualified panel of educators.

The emphasis of the Junior Miss Program at all levels is on excellence in scholarship, poise and personality, character, physical well-being, creativity, and in dealings with fellow humans.

Deborah was awarded a \$1,250 scholarship to the college of her choice for becoming S. C. Junior Miss. She plans to enroll next fall as a freshman at Winthrop College at Rock Hill, which also awards her further scholarship funds.

Deborah will represent S. C. in the 25th annual America's Junior Miss competition in Mobile, Ala., this summer. The program is not a beauty pageant, but seeks to recognize, reward and encourage excellence in young people by presenting college scholarships and other awards to outstanding high school senior girls. Each year more than \$2 million in college scholarships and other awards are offered to Junior Miss participants at the local, state and national levels.

In keeping with the claim that this contest is a scholarship program rather than a beauty pageant, Billy M. Harris of Sumter, chairman of the S.C. Junior Miss Program and manager for Deborah as the new state Junior Miss, says the young woman chosen state winner is never crowned queen. Instead, Deborah and her predecessors were given a pewter medallion, trophy, bouquet of roses, a lettered sash for her gown and a two-week all expense paid trip to Mobile for the National Program, the final night of which will be broadcast on network television.

In addition to Mr. and Mrs. Baker, those attending the event in Sumter were Deborah's brothers, Hartwell Baker III and Rob Hinson, of Bennettsville; her paternal grandfather, Hartwell Baker, and Mrs. Joan Ervin of Cheraw; Mr. and Mrs. John E. McIntyre, George McIntyre, Miss Phyllis Roberts, and George Chandler (preliminaries) of Clio; and Mr. and Mrs. Arch Fowler of Columbia.

Deborah's BHS faculty advisor and sponsor, Miss Alisa Goodman of Bennettsville, and her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Goodman of Rockingham, N.C. were also among those there for the final event.

Upon Deborah's arrival in Bennettsville Sunday afternoon she was met by an official motorcade and was transferred to a convertible with city police escort. At McDonald's she was greeted by City Administrator Milby Gibson who presented her with a bouquet of red roses. Hubert Meggs, Jr., president of the Marlboro County Chamber of Commerce, and Mrs. Linda Leviner, secretary to the Chamber, presented a bouquet of red poinsettias.

She was joyfully greeted and congratulated by numerous of her high school friends, family and family friends.

IN AMERICA, THE PEOPLE RULE AND NOW THEY DEMAND ACTION AGAINST CRIME

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, this past week I read a very disturbing editorial in the Irish Echo. It seems the people (whom we allege to represent), no longer have confidence in the ability of their elected officials to deal with the Nation's crime problem. Quite frankly, I concur with the author of this editorial. Despite the outrage of millions of American citizens, Congress and other legislative, judicial, and executive authorities have consistently ignored their responsibility to represent the will of the people.

It has been said that there is no greater force than an idea whose time has come. The following piece suggests that the idea this time around is that the people must act to get things done and not rely on lawmakers. That is a very sobering thought, and I urge my colleagues to consider it carefully. The editorial follows:

[From the Irish Echo, Jan. 16, 1982]

CRIME—OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM

As 1982 gets underway crime remains the major concern of the man and woman on the street. It is a world wide problem facing virtually every nation, but here we will concern ourselves with its implications to life in our own nation.

Throughout the United States the effect of the escalating crime rate has virtually changed the way we live our lives. Patterns of travel, of commerce, of entertainment have been drastically changed in the past several years.

As a matter of simple fact all of us have had to change the way we do things because society—and that too is all of us—has been unable to control the rapacious criminal population among us. It is up to the public to solve this problem because the politicians never will. Most politicians talk a good game but when it comes to action they are almost useless. Most of them react to organized pressure groups which represent few people and ignore the vast majority of people.

In the coming weeks we will make a number of proposals aimed at bringing the violent crime epidemic under control. In these proposals we will advocate the restoration of the death penalty for murder, rape and arson; a national handgun control law; and the hiring of many more policemen.

All of these proposals have been ridiculed in the past by the small pressure groups that get politicians to do what they want while ordinary citizens suffer the consequences of rampant crime.

We believe it is time to overcome these small pressure groups which allow crime to continue in America and we intend to press for action to bring about the will of the people.

It is time Americans were once again able to walk in the streets of their nation without fear.●

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT CUTS—6 MONTHS LATER

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, this summer President Reagan rammed over \$35 billion in budget cuts through the Congress. One of these cuts eliminated social security survivor benefits for all future college students except for a few beneficiaries currently in their senior year in high school who are able to enroll in college before May of this year.

I deeply regret that a majority of my colleagues voted to eliminate these payments to students whose parents have died, become disabled, or retired. This is the cruelest sort of benefit cut, one which goes into effect almost immediately without giving those students who were counting on receiving this income the chance to make other preparations.

The suffering and confusion has only been exacerbated by the Social Security Administration, which has been unwilling to notify current high school seniors of a way in which, under current law, they can prevent the termination of their benefit payments.

I wish to submit an article by Mike Barnicle that was recently printed in the Boston Globe. Mr. Barnicle describes some of the day-to-day human tragedies that are the result of the ill-conceived and unfair budget cuts contained in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. Six months after the act was signed into law, its harmful impact on social security beneficiaries and their families is becoming increasingly clear.

THE INNOCENT SURVIVORS

(By Mike Barnicle)

His father died on Jan. 8, so by Jan. 22, Jim Burns, the vice president of the senior class at Peabody High School, had dropped out of school and was over at North Shore Community College, where he enrolled as a freshman. He had to do this, the 17-year-old did, because last fall a majority of the men and women in the Congress of the United States voted to cut back on the benefits paid to survivors under the Social Security Act.

"He had to leave high school in order to get the benefits," Jack Wilson, the boy's home room teacher and senior class adviser was saying. "We've had about a dozen kids this year here at Peabody High who have had to leave high school for the same reason."

The Social Security Act, nearly 50 years old, became law during hard times. It has been a witness through the years to the fact that government is best when it tries to care for those unable to care for themselves.

Last fall, President Ronald Reagan, a man in his 70s who has spent decades living in the middle of luxury, comfort and wealth, kept urging the Congress to cut nearly

everything in the budget except money for Pentagon toys. Among high-priority items to be slashed was the Survivor's Benefits program.

It used to be that if your father died, you would get a Social Security benefit check until you reached 18. The checks averaged about \$225 a month. You could continue getting a benefit check until age 21 if you were enrolled in college.

Under Reagan's government, all of this has changed. Now, you have to be enrolled in college by May 1982, in order to obtain the benefits. Thus, the case of Jim Burns.

"But I just found out today that Jim isn't eligible to go to North Shore Community College," Judy Burns, the boy's mother was saying Friday. "The new law reads that you had to be getting the benefits in September of 1981 to qualify. Jim's father just died three weeks ago, so on Monday he'll have to go back to Peabody High."

"I had called the Social Security office about it at first and they gave me the wrong information. That's why Jim dropped out and enrolled in college in the first place. It makes me sick but I guess there's not a damn thing I can do about it. It really did bother him to have to leave his school but he's a sensible kid and he knew he had to do it."

"Who'd you vote for?" she was asked.

"Reagan," Judy Burns answered.

"What do you think now?"

"I don't know," she said. "I can't believe this is how he wanted it to work. I can't believe that he's really aware of how much he's hurting people, middle-class people. I guess you'd have to say I'm disillusioned."

"I voted for him because I thought that we had to end all this reckless government spending. But you don't realize the impact of things like this until it hits home. The thing that bothers me almost more than anything is that the people at Social Security didn't even inform me correctly."

"It has two effects," the teacher Wilson, said. "It has an effect on the kids who had to leave. On Friday, Jim was a high school senior and on Monday he's a college freshman. Most kids have a whole summer to prepare for that. He had a weekend."

"A parent has died and that's why they have to leave school. That's disturbing enough. You miss a lot if you miss your last year. There's a great deal of social activity in their senior year."

"It also affects the seniors who are still in school," Wilson said. "There are a lot of close, emotional relationships in this senior class. The other kids are disturbed too."

Much of the direction of government in the last 12 months has been aimed at dismantling programs that have helped the multitudes. Tell the political mind that cutting a budget is popular and all you will get is a reaction: no thought, no wondering about who gets hurt and how much they get hurt. Just the reaction and the lunge to cut spending, any spending at all, so long as it appears to be popular with the handful of millionaires who run the country from Wall Street and the White House.

Major items of interest here are things like food stamps, welfare, college loans and survivor's benefits. The military get everything they want because they use the magic word, "Russia" and the congressmen get an automatic \$75-a-day expense allowance to write off on their taxes and Jim Burns gets to go back and forth from college to high school in the space of three weeks and a benefit check that runs out in June.

Reagan, who appears as amiable as a game-show host when seen on the televi-

sion, does nothing to displease the wealthy. He is the President of people who don't have to worry about things like illness or college tuition. ●

A SKEPTIC CONVINCED MINIMUM TILLAGE FARMING SAVES TOPSOIL

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, we have taken great strides toward solving the serious problem of topsoil loss on America's farmlands. However, unless we act responsibly, we still face a future whose landscape may include drastically reduced farm production because of soil erosion.

I speak with a sense of urgency when I ask Congress and farmers across the Nation to recognize the need for agricultural practices that utilize conservation techniques. According to the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), we are losing approximately 4 billion tons of topsoil per year. This may eventually raise costs and reduce yields for our farmers, thus decreasing the quantity of vital food supplies available to the Nation and for export.

We possess today the know-how to decrease topsoil loss by up to 75 percent, according to CAST, without losing land productivity or profit. I am speaking of minimum-tillage farming and no-till ridge planting, as explained in the book by Ernest E. Behn, "More Profit With Less Tillage." One of my constituents from Iowa, Glenn Tjossem, wrote me exclaimed his success with this exciting new technique.

Glenn writes:

Concerning till planting on the ridge, like the doubter in a recent article, I also thought, "It might work on your farm, but our low gumbo fields would be different," but now find I was wrong. After a few years of using "till plant on the ridge," our sons who are now taking over the farming ask, "Why didn't you do this 10 years ago!" My only reply is, "I didn't think it would work in our gumbo type soil. We're never too old to learn!"

He explains:

In our operation we save at least 8,000 gallons of diesel fuel, and about 72 man days on a 12 gallon per hour tractor per year. We have traded off our large 4 wheel drive tractors, as the power requirement of this method is less than ½ of conventional method. These are a few of the benefits of "till planting on the ridge" but the main reason is that there is no visible loss of soil or water in our rotation of corn and soybeans, the soybean being the big problem with erosion, especially on the loess soil type we have here.

Glenn continues:

About half of the land we farm is contoured, and the slopes there are terraced. We think we now have terraces we do not

need. In Behn's book he mentions, "If the slope isn't over 3 or 4 percent no terraces are needed," as this system puts a small terrace over 30 inches. With more rolling land, this system would work well in conjunction with terraces.

I was excited by the comments in Glenn's letter, especially since they come from a self-processed doubter. His examples of fuel and time savings, the need for less powerful machinery, few terraces—on top of conserving soil and water, should certainly persuade the rest of us.

Congress plays a central role in influencing the Nation's farm production. Present policies often encourage excessive erosion for short-term, maximum production, and this results in soil deterioration. I urge Congress to redirect its emphasis on agricultural policy toward soil conservation. Farmers should be encouraged to adopt this method of farming to assure a future of productive land use in America. ●

SYNFUEL FOLLY

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, last week, 13 colleagues and I introduced H.R. 5404, legislation to abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. We concluded that during a time when we face massive budget deficits, the sort of corporate welfare for major energy companies represented by the Synthetic Fuels Corporation could not be justified.

Stephen Chapman, writing in the February 4, 1982, edition of the Chicago Tribune, came to exactly the same conclusion. I commend his comments to my colleagues with the hope you will join me in the effort to abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, which Mr. Chapman so accurately describes as a "monument to bureaucratic folly."

Ronald Reagan was the candidate who promised a free market in energy, unencumbered by the help or hindrance of a meddlesome bureaucracy. So why does the Synthetic Fuels Corporation still exist? And why does the President tolerate it?

On the campaign trail, Reagan was unequivocal in blaming the government for the nation's energy problems. "Free enterprise can do a better job of producing the things that people need than government can," he declared. "The Department of Energy . . . hasn't produced a quart of oil or a lump of coal."

This is not the type of thinking which created the Synthetic Fuels Corporation (SFC). A reaction to the 1979 gasoline shortage, it was supposed to spawn a full-scale industry capable of producing up to 2 million barrels of oil per day. It also promised to be one of the century's most extravagant boondoggles, with a projected price tag of \$88 billion.

Such figures inspired horror in the faint-hearted. But to the bold visionaries responsible for the program, it was proof of America's resolve to be free of OPEC. "The scope of this project," boasted President Carter, "is greater than the sum total of the interstate highway system, the Marshall Plan and the space program combined." In the most optimistic dreams of its founders, this mammoth enterprise would have taken more than a decade to achieve the unimpressive goal of reducing the nation's demand for conventional oil by 11 percent.

Those dreams are not likely to be fulfilled, though the SFC has fared better under Reagan than anyone had a right to expect. Last year he decided not to dismantle the SFC or slash its budget, ignoring the pleas of budget director David Stockman. It can spend up to \$14.8 billion over the next three years—though by making only loan and price guarantees, it could postpone the cost for several years.

The White House, however, has not yet declared the agency "operational," which would give it control of the synfuels projects currently supervised by the Energy Department. Nearly three years after the first gasoline lines appeared in California, the SFC has yet to award a single contract for the production of synthetic fuel.

The energy picture, of course, has changed dramatically since the panic of '79. Then everyone assumed that OPEC's stranglehold on the world oil market would guarantee steadily rising prices through the 1980s. The only way to guard against that threat, Congress and the Carter administration agreed, was to wean ourselves off of imported oil. One means was synthetic fuel—oil and gas made from shale, coal and tar sands.

In practice, things haven't worked out as expected. Instead of continuing their upward spiral, oil prices have remained more or less fixed for two years. Prices in the U.S. were supposed to skyrocket following Reagan's decontrol of oil and gasoline prices shortly after he took office, but they didn't. Since the end of 1979, in fact, the real price of oil (adjusted for inflation) has actually fallen.

The road ahead also looks reasonably smooth. Last summer Business Week reported that "oil company planners, energy economists in the U.S. and elsewhere, and even some OPEC officials are predicting steady—or possible—declining—world oil prices for the rest of this year and only a minimal increase at best in 1982 and the years beyond." Sheikh Yamani himself admits, "Within the next few years, there are no factors of any kind allowing an increase in the oil price. Such an action would be suicidal."

So why do we need the Synthetic Fuels Corporation? Its original purpose was to free us from our dependence on imported oil. But OPEC's own price increases have done much to accomplish the same thing. Since 1977, our oil imports have fallen by 34 percent.

Moreover, the prime reason for reducing that dependence—namely the prospect of soaring prices—has likewise vanished. If we can have conventional oil at stable prices, we don't need for more expensive substitutes. And the threat of blackmail from any major oil producing nation, never terribly credible, has diminished along with our demand for their product. There is always the chance that one of the Arab nations will be forced, by war or revolution, to halt production. But that is why we have a Strategic

Petroleum Reserve which the administration intends to fill.

The SFC should be especially offensive to an administration that believes in the free market. Its only function is to encourage, through price and loan guarantees, and possibly through direct subsidies, the production of fuels too expensive to compete with existing energy sources. If they could be produced at competitive prices, synfuels would need no federal assistance.

During the 1980 campaign, Reagan earned much derision from Jimmy Carter with his insistence that the free market could solve most of our energy problems, if the government would only let it. Since then, in fact, it has done just that. Reagan has been vindicated, Carter discredited. Maybe the President wants to keep the SFC as a monument to bureaucratic folly. If so, he has discovered the only useful purpose it will ever serve. ●

TERRORISTS ATTACK

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, January 29, the Turkish General Counsel in Los Angeles, Kemal Arikan, was shot to death in a senseless act of terrorism. A group calling itself the Justice Commandos of Armenian Genocide claims responsibility for the action, and Los Angeles police have arrested suspected assailants.

As an American of Armenian descent, I totally abhor the incident that took place in my home State, and I am not alone in my denouncement.

The United Armenian Commemorative Committee's central California region has issued a statement regarding this incident that I should like to share with my colleagues. That statement reads:

We are all deeply disturbed and shocked by the murder of a Turkish diplomat in Los Angeles. We condemn it as a vile act of cowardice.

All such violence, no matter what the provocation, is abhorrent to all civilized people everywhere, and cannot be "explained" away.

Such dastardly acts of violence are especially repulsive to Armenian-Americans in Fresno, and all terrorists, no matter what groups, nationality, ethnic identity or political persuasion they profess, are, as President Reagan said, cowards.

It is wrong for the Turkish government to deny the first Genocide of the 20th Century—and it is equally wrong for anyone to resort to murder to undo a previous murder.

Our sympathy and prayers go out to the slain diplomat's family and we pray, along with all people seeking justice and peace, for an end to such senseless violence! ●

TIME FOR THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE A BREATH ON EL SALVADOR

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I am concerned about the tragic situation in strife-torn El Salvador. It appears that both sides in this conflict are guilty of some of the most inhumane treatment of innocent people that the world has ever seen.

Recent days have yielded news accounts detailing a level of violence, bloodshed, and carnage almost beyond comprehension. I am convinced that it is time for the United States to terminate military assistance to the Government of El Salvador since it is clear that some of this material is being used to further the bloodshed and destruction.

Recently, a network analyzed the administration's alternatives in dealing with El Salvador as unacceptable on the one hand—referring to the possibility of a Marxist takeover—and undesirable on the other hand—referring to the support of a government that appears to be unable—or, as some aver, unwilling—to halt the slaughter of its innocent citizens.

Certainly the choices and options of El Salvador are not easy. But, the presence of military equipment makes it unlikely that nonmilitary or diplomatic options to end the war will be explored fully and completely.

Mr. Speaker, what is now needed is a step back, a deep breath, an end to the killing so that the parties can get on with the talk of peace.

That is why I have added my name to House Joint Resolution 399, legislation introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts Representative GERRY STUDS, which seeks to suspend military assistance to the Government of El Salvador.

House Joint Resolution 399 could provide the halt—the change in mood and tempo—needed to achieve a lasting peace in El Salvador. ●

TRIBUTE TO MR. TSUROMOTO

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate Mr. Matsutaro Tsurumoto on the occasion of his 90th birthday. Mr. Tsurumoto will mark his 90 years on March 2, 1982,

and I would like to bring attention to his accomplishments.

Mr. Tsuromoto, a native of Japan, emigrated to the United States in 1909 at the age of 16, and soon thereafter settled in the Mount Eden area of Alameda County. It was here he began his legacy of establishing an extensive sharecropping network of strawberry farmers. His farming influence was further manifested through his participation in the San Francisco-Central California Berry Growers Association, as a board member, and as president of the East Bay Farming Corp. His agricultural interests were not confined to growing strawberries, as he farmed the T. & M. Vineyard in Cortez, Calif., and maintained 100 acres of property there at the young age of 27.

As a U.S. citizen, Mr. Tsuromoto has contributed extensively to his community. In 1930, he established and was superintendent of the Alvarado Japanese Language School, always concerned that English be mastered in order to succeed in this country. He served on the Alameda Buddhist Church District Council, and on the Alvarado Japanese Association Board.

Mr. Tsuromoto has had a full and rewarding 90 years. He is now the father of 4, grandfather of 11, and great-grandfather of 4. For all of his efforts, Mr. Tsuromoto recently received the Japanese governmental decoration, the Order of the Sacred Treasure, Sixth Class.

I would like to add my commendation and congratulations for all of Mr. Tsuromoto's achievements that have comprised his 90 years and to extend to him a hearty and sincere wish for a very happy birthday.●

ASSASSINATION OF THE TURKISH CONSUL GENERAL IN LOS ANGELES

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, It is with outrage and consternation that I have read the news of the assassination of the Turkish Consul General in Los Angeles on January 28, 1982, by Armenian terrorists.

This is not the first assassination to occur with respect to Turkish officials in our country. In 1973, the Turkish Consul General and the Turkish Consul were killed in Los Angeles by an Armenian American. Since 1973, 21 Turkish diplomats and/or members of their families have been killed in Western Europe and Australia. However, this marks the first incident of its kind since 1973 on American soil.

The organization claiming responsibility for the killing, as well as for the

bombing of General Consul Kemal Arikan's home last fall, is the Justice Commandos of Armenian Genocide. If you recall the intercommunal warfare between the Turks and Armenians during World War I, you will remember that they resulted in the deaths of majority of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and resulted in 500,000 Armenians fleeing to Russia and Lebanon. They also resulted in the deaths of several hundred thousand Turks. These terrorists claim "revenge" by killing Turkish diplomats.

If we could accept their arguments, we would return to the law of the jungle and Hobbesian conditions, and our streets would become the battleground for foreign vendettas. Furthermore, these Armenian terrorists attack the diplomats of our trusted NATO ally: Turkey. Their sister group, ASALA (Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia) is strictly Marxist and wants to attach Eastern Anatolia to Soviet Armenia.

May I again condemn in no uncertain terms the dastardly killing of the respected Turkish diplomat and may I at this juncture insert into the RECORD the speech of His Excellency Sukru Elekdag, Ambassador of Turkey to the United States at Mr. Kemal Arikan's funeral.

REMARKS OF DR. SUKRU ELEKDAG AT THE FUNERAL OF KEMAL ARIKAN

Kemal Arikan, the Los Angeles Consul General of the Turkish Republic, on the 28th day of January, while discharging his duties, fell victim to a dastardly crime in this city.

In addition to bringing profound sorrow to Mr. Arikan's family, his friends and his colleagues, his loss has brought grief to the Turkish Nation, whose valued son has fallen in its service.

Kemal Arikan, the Consul General of an allied and friendly country to the United States, his family, and his entire consular staff, had been carrying out their duties here in Los Angeles under constant threat and harassment. Kemal Arikan's residence was bombed, his office was bombed, and his life threatened repeatedly.

Kemal Arikan is the third Turkish Diplomat to have been murdered in Los Angeles. In 1973, Turkish Consul General Baydar and Deputy Consul General Demir were shot down by an Armenian. During the ensuing period, 17 Turkish diplomats or members of their immediate families were murdered in different parts of the world by Armenian terrorist organizations. In other words, the chain of killing and shedding of innocent life that was initiated here in Los Angeles, has, after claiming so many victims, come full circle.

Persons claiming to represent the Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide have taken responsibility for the assassination of Kemal Arikan. The same organization has also claimed responsibility for the murders of the Turkish Ambassador to the Vatican, Taha Carim, the wife of the Turkish Ambassador to Spain, Necla Kunalalp, retired Ambassador Besir Balciglu, the Turkish Consul General in Sidney, Australia, Sarik Ariyak, and his aide Engin Sever.

The Armenian Justice Commandos have also declared that, together with ASALA, an

Armenian Communist terrorist group, they have assassinated Ahmet Benler, son of the Turkish Ambassador to the Netherlands, and Yilnar Dalcin, Press Counselor in Paris.

Last week's murder of Kemal Arikan is clear evidence that Armenian terrorists have expanded their network in the United States to intensify their wanton, criminal acts here. It would be a big mistake to dissociate Kemal Arikan's murder either from all those which preceded it or from the acts of terrorism to which General Dozier and Charles Ray, the American military attaché in Paris, were subjected. These and other recent terrorist acts are related and part of a larger phenomenon, an integral plan to weaken and subvert the societies of the Free World.

ASALA, the Armenian Secret Army for the liberation of Armenia, for example, is an avowed Communist organization whose declared mission is to detach a strategically important part of Turkey and annex it to Soviet Armenia. It is clear that ASALA receives support from other, non-Armenian, terrorist organizations in Europe and the Middle East and from Marxist-Leninist entities. These groups share a common objective—the destruction of these societies in which Western ideals and liberties can flourish.

It should not be forgotten that these terrorist organizations, in many instances, attempt to appear to champion the illusory goals of various groups whenever they can use such goals and groups for their own dark purposes. The pretext for the murder of Kemal Arikan, as with the murders of his predecessors here in 1973, reportedly is to avenge a grievance which stems from misrepresented events of almost 70 years ago. The continued propagation of this distortion of history breeds vengefulness from generation to generation and plays into the hands of Armenian terrorists.

In Turkey, there are tens of thousands of people whose parents and other close relatives perished because of Armenian actions during the tragic incidents of 1913 in the midst of World War I. But, these Turks have chosen to lasso bitterness and to adopt a spirit of peaceful reconciliation. It is senseless to open the wounds of 70 years ago when the world has been striving to heal the wounds of the far more recent Second World War.

One would hope that the Armenians of goodwill will condemn terrorists who shed innocent blood in 1982 and repudiate their actions. Likewise, we should be alert to brand as counterfeit those condemnations of terrorists that in the same breath rationalize it. These are especially disturbing when they are uttered by public officials.

The reopening of ancient wounds is also senseless because the Turkish Republic, whose foundation was constructed over the ruins of the Ottoman Empire after World War I, today is a strong, robust state of 46,000,000, a valued member of the Western world, and a staunch ally of the United States. Turkey has the power, the capacity, and the will to preserve the integrity of its homeland and to protect it from the designs of its enemies.

Americans, no less than Turks, cannot tolerate terrorism. The security of the public domain is a primary requirement for a free society, whether in the cities of Europe or in cities such as Los Angeles.

Terrorism is a dreadful plague of our era and a scourge to be eradicated. If the Western world is unable to deal with it, our societies will be disabled. It behooves all civil-

ized countries to work for an effective cooperation in the fight against international terrorism.●

JOHN D. CAEMMERER, 1928-82

HON. JOHN LeBOUITILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. LeBOUITILLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I note the passing of one of the most influential leaders of my home State of New York, State Senator John D. Caemmerer.

Senator Caemmerer died on February 7, and his death is deeply mourned by his constituents, friends, legislative colleagues, and officials throughout America who have profited from his leadership in the field of transportation.

Senator Caemmerer was elected to the New York State Senate in 1966, and emerged from relatively obscure freshman status to become one of the most influential and highly-regarded leaders in the State. Senator Caemmerer was the most active and influential chairman of the Senate's Transportation Committee that the Senate has ever seen, and his imprint on New York's mass transit legislation is deep and everlasting.

"When I started to call for operating subsidies in 1968," The New York Times recalled Caemmerer as saying, "I was looked on almost as a socialist in my own party."

Senator Caemmerer's prescient views on the cold, hard facts of subway operations saved the decrepit New York mass transit network from total collapse. His stands on this issue in particular, and on many others in general, reflected a strong intellectual and moral independence. Senator Caemmerer was not merely a legislator; he was a statesman. New York came first. Public welfare came before politics. Quality came before anything else. John Caemmerer was a firm believer in the age-old truism, "Good government is good politics."

New Yorkers will miss John Caemmerer's unflagging and committed fight for better transportation and better State government. His constituents will miss his heartfelt attention to their needs. American transportation policymakers will miss his invaluable input. His friends and family will miss his good cheer, compassion, and bravery.

John Caemmerer is survived by his wife, Joan, who played an active part in the Senator's public career. To her and his five children, I express my deepest sympathies.

We mourn the loss of John Caemmerer; we will never forget the lesson

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that he taught all of us about good government.●

HORRY HONORS VETS

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, America owes a great debt of gratitude to its 30 million veterans. It is also comforting to note that, in many instances, our veterans continue their leadership roles when they return to civilian life. One such individual who has shown a commitment to the betterment of his fellow human beings, and veterans especially, is Bill Davis of Galivants Ferry, S.C. Mr. Davis was recently recognized for his contributions to the improvement of his community, especially in education and agriculture.

As chairman of the Horry County Board of Education, Bill Davis has provided unequalled leadership in the quest for quality education there for more than a quarter of a century. His activism has been contagious also in agriculture, an industry in which he is highly esteemed for his successful management of one of the largest farm operations in the Sixth Congressional District. He is a national leader in the tobacco industry.

I offer the following news article for the RECORD, and Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Bill Davis as an exemplary citizen and public servant, active in the affairs of his fellow man and a positive force for good in the Sixth Congressional District, in South Carolina, and in the Nation.

[From the Horry Independent, Nov. 17, 1981]

HORRY HONORS VETS

American Legion posts in Conway and Aynor gathered on Veterans Day Nov. 11 to pay tribute to those who have defended the nation.

In Aynor, several hundred people braved nippy winter weather to observe the Aynor American Legion Post 81's Veteran's Day Parade and celebration.

In Conway, American Legion Post 111 marked the annual observance by presenting its distinguished service award to Bill Davis of Galivants Ferry.

Despite a nippy wind and occasional showers, citizens of Aynor gathered to pay homage to American veterans. A parade of dignitaries, beauty pageant contestants and veterans wound through the streets of the town.

Later, Edward T. Pendarvis, past department commander of the American Legion, gave the keynote address.

"This country owes a debt of gratitude to its fighting men and women that can never be repaid," said Pendarvis, a Charleston real estate developer. "America's the greatest nation in the history of the world not because of our great resources, but because of the men and women who live here and who have made their indelible stamp."

Among the special guests at the Aynor celebration were Gold Star mother Stella Tyler and World War I veterans Bruce Altman and Mack Johnson.

Bill Davis, chairman of the Horry County Board of Education, received Post III's highest public service award at a banquet Wednesday night attended by several hundred legionnaires and their wives.

Capt. George Stein, UNS (Ret.), head of the Naval Junior ROTC unit at Conway High School, was the guest speaker.

Davis was cited for his long history of service to the community by Dave Altman who presented the award.

Special guests included Mr. and Mrs. Bill Leftridge, American Legion Zone 4 Commander of Florence.

General manager of Holiday enterprises, Davis has served on the local, state and national levels. A native of Aynor, he has been chairman of the board of education for 26 years. He also serves as president of the Horry County Farm Bureau.●

BUSING: A CHESS GAME WITH NO WINNERS

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate passed the strictest antibusing language ever approved by either House of Congress. While I applaud this action by our colleagues, I am concerned that these provisions do not go far enough.

The Federal Government does not have the right to dictate where our children should and should not go to school. We must pass a constitutional amendment to guarantee the right of our children to attend their neighborhood school.

The American people are not the kind of people who will tolerate a government that fails to heed their warnings.

They are not the kind of people to sit in Washington and deny them the opportunity to decide for themselves whether or not busing their children is the answer.

They are not the kind of people who will let us sit in silence while miles away a handful of "experts" move their children around as if they were merely pawns in a master chess game—where no one ever wins.

But they are the kind of people who will refuse to elect representatives who will continue to misrepresent them.

And they are the kind of people who will refuse to relinquish that for which they have fought the hardest—to decide what is best for their children.

They are that kind of people for one reason, Mr. Speaker. It is because all their lives they have been promised that all they need do is raise up their voices so that we can hear them. They

are raising their voices today, and it is time that we listened. I ask my colleagues to hear those voices and sign the discharge petition which will bring this resolution to the floor of the House.●

NEOPACIFISM, ANTIAMERICAN STYLE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the more disturbing and dangerous trends in international affairs in recent years has been a revival of a kind of pacifism in Europe and, to a lesser degree, in the United States. I say a kind of pacifism because it is apparent that what we might call the neo-pacifists direct their criticism at the United States much more than they do at the Soviet Union. There are, of course, elements of hate-America in this movement, mingled with a genuine fear of a nuclear war, and—to what degree no one is certain—Communist manipulation of naive and uninformed people.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an article by John Boland which showed how one leftist think tank is trying to exploit pacifist feelings in the United States. The Institute for Policy Studies, a group that directs considerable energy and intellectual talent to criticism of the foreign policies and defense policies of the United States, while ignoring the Soviet Union, recently held a conference at which the question of anti-American pacifism was enthusiastically endorsed. John Boland gives a chilling and accurate picture of the leftist mentality at work.

We cannot afford to ignore the move toward pacifism in our country. Already the cause of an anti-American pacifism has received support from otherwise respectable sources, such as church leaders. The aim of this movement, whether it is directly stated or hidden, is the unilateral disarmament of the United States.

This would be a disastrous calamity for the human race. We cannot simply dismiss this move to disarm our Nation and weaken the will of the West. The arguments of the anti-American pacifists have to be countered openly and effectively. I hope we are doing this in our tax-supported worldwide information programs.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD "Peace, War and the Institute for Policy Studies," from the Wall Street Journal, February 5, 1982:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1982]

PEACE, WAR AND THE INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES

(By John Boland)

WASHINGTON.—Among Washington think tanks, the Institute for Policy Studies sets a mean pace. It criticizes the United States as engaging in militarism, imperialism and domestic repression, assails multinational corporate power, and provides a forum and political lobbying arm for Third World liberation movements. A recent colloquium at the Institute's headquarters here brought together about a hundred persons, including fellows from IPS and its Transnational Institute affiliate, at least three congressional staff members, a U.S. coordinator for Palestinian organizations and a number of university students. The theme was "Prospects for Peace and War," and the purpose was to try out ideas for building a major U.S. disarmament movement. That cause already has enlisted dozens of other groups, from pacifist Catholic bishops to the Soviet-influenced World Peace Council.

While the campaign resembles the Vietnam-era resistance movement, its ambitions are far grander: nothing less than the Atlantic Alliance's demise, a neutral Europe and U.S. disarmament.

Soviet militarism aroused little alarm. Amid chatter about the "reaction" and "viciousness" of the Reagan administration, about capitalism's "hegemonic presumptions," Fred Halliday, a Transnational fellow, tried to explain Soviet missile deployment against Western Europe. "All the Russians have done with the SS-20 is try to catch up," said Mr. Halliday. Agitation in Europe by an "unflinching neutralist and pacifist movement," opposing the basing of NATO nuclear weapons, Mr. Halliday observed, could mark a breakthrough against East-West "bloc logic," and hasten the alliance's dissolution, "which in my view is what should happen."

"The idea that we're going to win the arms race is absurd," declared Richard Barnett, a former official in the Kennedy administration, and a founder of IPS in 1963. "The hopeful element in all that is that by turning on the rhetoric, Reagan has scared the American people and the allies more than the Russians. That's done more for the European peace movement than anything else." Citing a poll finding that 47 percent of the American people expect a nuclear war within five years, Mr. Barnett added: "That the security policy developed by the administration is disbelieved by so much of the population suggests great possibilities for an American peace movement. The possibilities will increase as we see the economic damage of the arms race."

Marcus Raskin, co-founder of the Institute, urged a moral campaign to put nuclear weapons "outside the frame of reference of any strategic defense of the United States." Building them and aiming them at cities, he insisted, could be treated as a "war crime." American scientists could be pressed to take a "Hippocratic oath" refusing to build nuclear weapons.

One early test for that kind of thinking is the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament, scheduled for June 9 to July 7 in New York. A favorable public and media response to demonstration and pulpit-pounding surrounding that session will encourage IPS and other groups that the U.S. may be receptive to a peace mobilization. In coming months, the Institute plans to train speakers for campus road

shows in hopes of having a disarmament bandwagon rolling by fall.

Is all this wishful thinking? Especially given Afghanistan, Poland and the public's seeming rightward drift? Skeptics within the IPS orbit argue that two major elements needed for a neutralist movement are lacking in the United States; exploitable fear of a limited nuclear conflict in one's backyard, a theme the left has been drumming home in Europe; and the nationalistic exhilaration of kicking Americans and their weapons out.

With the audience generally sympathetic, some speakers felt free to let their hair down more than they do when writing for the Nation and the New York Times op-ed page. There was general agreement, for example, that the disarmament message couldn't be sold on its merits all the time, but such issues as economic burdens and unemployment would help recruit support. Chester Hartman, a visiting fellow at IPS, referred to "savage" domestic budget cuts in food stamps, Medicaid, public housing and other welfare programs. By identifying the cost of C-5 transport planes and other military hardware in terms of numbers of people cut from social benefits, he suggested, the left could excite resistance. "Don't forget that this becomes a two-way argument," he counseled. "The more money we succeed in pulling to domestic uses, the less will be available for getting those C-5s built and our rapid deployment force around the world."

Issues of Soviet expansion and repression were deflected with denunciations of U.S. support of the "murderous oligarchs of El Salvador" and of plots for intervention against the struggling democrats in Nicaragua. Declared Fred Halliday: "The hypocrisy of the Reagan government on Poland is just beyond belief," because while assailing repression there the U.S. has been aiding El Salvador, Pakistan, the Sudan and other repressive right-wing regimes. "The actual level of repression is less" in Poland, according to Mr. Halliday, than in "20 or 30" of the U.S. and Britain's allies. A bit later, IPS fellow Michael Moffitt referred in passing to Third World countries that are "more democratic in the bourgeois sense"—as opposed to those that have been liberated.

One schism disrupted things. Fred Halliday announced that if Western Europe had rejected U.S. Pershing II missiles in return for the Polish government's granting Solidarity a role, Poland wouldn't be under martial law. The suggestion of NATO complicity in Poland evoked an outburst from one of left journalism's elders, I. F. Stone. Condemning the Soviet Union's sentencing of members of the Helsinki watchdog committee, Stone cried: "Why did they have to send these few brave people to Siberia? What were they so afraid of? . . . The rigidity of this regime is a disgrace. They've destroyed socialism morally." On Poland, he snapped: "You can't blame it on Reagan. It's a big event. . . . These clichés are not good enough for reaching our fellow citizens and urging caution."

Fred Halliday was wounded. "It's not cliché," he said. "It's a central theme of the European peace movement—shared responsibility."

Mr. Stone wasn't present for later sessions, so he missed a ringing apology for Soviet expansion by Saul Landau, a TNI fellow recently returned from conferring with Sandinista officials in Nicaragua. Said Mr. Landau: "Anti-Sovietism is the key to the [Cold War] ideology. It's one of the

great divisors within the progressive movement, and we have to deal with it. . . . The Soviet Union has been the one insurance policy of successful [Third World] revolutions."

Mr. Landau, who a few years ago told a Cuban friend that he planned to dedicate himself to "making propaganda for American socialism," saw hope for advance of the liberation cause. The language of Catholic priests in denouncing economic injustice and the language of Marxist-Leninist guerrillas are identical, Mr. Landau observed. ●

CARDINAL DEDICATES NEW ST. JOACHIM'S CHURCH

HON. JOSEPH F. SMITH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the parishioners of St. Joachim's Church, which is located in my district. The history of this church, which stretches over 100 years, is one of service to the community and concern for the needy people of the area.

Tragedy struck this church in 1979 when fire destroyed the church building. On December 13, a Mass of Dedication was celebrated for their new edifice. For this occasion, the Catholic Standard and Times published the following article, which pays tribute to the clergy who have served there and the people who have worshipped there:

[From the Catholic Standard and Times, Dec. 10, 1981]

CARDINAL DEDICATES NEW ST. JOACHIM'S CHURCH

Cardinal Krol will be the principal celebrant of a Mass of Dedication this Sunday, Dec. 13, at 3 p.m. when the new St. Joachim's Church in the Frankford section of Philadelphia is formally opened. The Cardinal will be assisted by 14 concelebrants, and he will also take part in a formal procession into the new church.

(St. Joachim's was destroyed by fire on June 8, 1979.)

The dedication of the new building is the latest chapter in the long history of St. Joachim's; the parish celebrated its 100th anniversary in June of 1974. Here are excerpts from the parish history booklet published when the parish celebrated its 100th birthday.

June 28, 1874, was another torrid day in Frankford. The thermometer was inching upward (it would eventually reach 89 degrees) and beads of moisture formed on the brows of the large crowd of people gathered on Pine St. On the outer edges of the crowd, the horses stood passively, their work half over. They had carried some important guests to the ceremony.

For the members of St. Joachim's Church, the day marked both an end and a beginning. The cleared ground on which they were standing once supported their old church, the first St. Joachim's built in 1845. It had been only nine years ago that the tall steeple had finally been fixed onto that first building at a cost of \$8,000. But the parish soon outgrew those first modest beginnings.

Now, Archbishop James Frederic Wood was here on Pine St. (later to become Church St.) laying the cornerstone for the new edifice, a \$90,000 gothic structure which would be regarded in an 1886 newspaper article as "one of the finest in the state and a lasting monument to the liberality of pious Catholics."

An intensive 1974 search for the cornerstone laid that day more than 100 years ago has failed to turn up the precious stone, which was freshly cut and polished that day by Bishop William O'Hara of Scranton, who preached to the large crowd at the ceremony.

Father Nicholas J. Walsh, pastor of St. Joachim's a century ago, wasn't thinking about 1974 when he watched the cement being troweled on the cornerstone that warm summer day. He had been pastor for two years and early in his tenure had gathered together his congregation to plan a new building. The old church had been condemned as unsafe and unfit for worship.

The Catholics in the Northeast, for whom St. Joachim's served as the only accessible church, needed a new building. Needs had changed. In 1845, the first church had a population of about 100 people, coming from Fox Chase, Jenkintown, Bustleton, Holmesburg and Tacony. Now there were thousands of worshipping Catholics.

Father Walsh, who came to St. Joachim's from Pottsville in 1872, began by building a temporary chapel on the site later occupied by St. Joachim's School. The temporary church built, the last Mass was said Sept. 15, 1873, in the old church, at one of the side altars because the main altar had already been removed. Down came the old church.

Before the new St. Joachim's was completed, Father Walsh was gone, transferred to St. Charles Borromeo, Philadelphia, in 1877. His work was carried on by the new pastor, Father John P. Byrne, who mixed patience and enthusiasm as the work and the financing of the new structure dragged on.

But finally, the last stone was fitted into place and the final polished walnut pew installed. The new St. Joachim's was dedicated on Oct. 17, 1880, with a sermon by Father B. A. Maguire, S.J., one of the most celebrated orators of his time. Pope Leo XIII sent his blessing and congratulations and Archbishop Wood officiated.

The school was completed in 1885 and cost at least \$25,000. It has a capacity of 1,200 students.

As the population of Philadelphia's Catholics grew, fed by the large influx of immigrants, many of them Irish and German, the newly-erected Catholic Church in Frankford found its parish list swelling. By 1886, St. Joachim's had nearly 4,000 worshippers and the outlying districts it once served were gradually obtaining their own churches.

St. Joachim's was a jewel in the quaint, row-home community of Frankford. On one side of the new church building stood the rectory, a patchwork of buildings from the 1850s and 1870s. On the other side, the convent for the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, who were in care of the school. The older convent had been opened in 1866, at an expense of over \$12,000.

To the rear of the new church was the old cemetery, which preceded the Catholic possession of the land and provided a note of eternity for the parishioners who filed into the Lord's House. The graveyard had been purchased by the church in 1861 and it was

in this cemetery that Father John P. Byrne, who had watched a parish mature in its new facilities, was laid to rest after a lengthy illness. He died Aug. 29, 1891.

One month later, on Sept. 24, 1891, there came to St. Joachim's a tall, portly priest with an aristocratic air, a man who was to dominate the scene at St. Joachim's Church for the next 34 years—Father Francis P. Fitzmaurice.

Under Father Fitzmaurice, St. Joachim's thrived. By 1897, the church boundaries had shrunk from the original far-reaching limits to those mentioned in a church calendar of that year: "South to Venango St. north to Dark Run Lane and east to Frankford Creek."

Father Fitzmaurice added more and more refinements, including an imposing bell tower, constructed by a local contractor, James J. Murphy.

In 1925, at the age of 77, Father Fitzmaurice died. In obedience to the pastor's last request, his body was buried in the cemetery behind the church, without ceremony.

Soon afterward, the parishioners contributed toward a \$2,145 memorial to the dead pastor. A moving plaque, entitled "An Appreciation," noted:

"He was with us so long that, like growing children in thinking of their parents, we never entertained the thought of his ceasing to be."

And finally, the memorial said: "Our love for him was reverence and our reverence for him was love. He is gone. His memory shall ever be with us. In the Firmament of our lives as a star of the first magnitude, his worth shall always shine."

St. Joachim's was driven through the next quarter of a century, through the Great Depression and World War II, by a dynamic priest with the build of a jockey and the tenacity of a Crusader—Father John B. Dever, a short, wiry man who managed tall feats in this third and final pastorate.

Father Dever had been born in Stoughton, Mass., received his priestly training in St. Charles Borromeo Seminary at Overbrook.

Succeeding Father Dever was Father Thomas A. McNally, a Kensington native who had attended St. Charles Seminary and was ordained in 1915.

His service to St. Joachim's was short, but full. It was Father McNally who began the rebuilding of the rectory at Church and Griscom Sts. He died on Dec. 2, 1952, before the work on the priests' house was finished.

Within a short time, Father James A. Donnelly, a West Philadelphia native and also a graduate of St. Charles Seminary, was named pastor of St. Joachim's.

Father Donnelly's return as pastor to St. Joachim's was a happy note, but it lasted only a short time. He died July 17, 1954, after a three-week illness. He was 59 years old.

In its next pastor, St. Joachim's was blessed with a priest whose piety and concern for the total church community earned him an undying respect and devotion. Father Francis A. Fagan, a man from Bethlehem, Pa., had been ordained a priest in 1924 by Dennis Cardinal Dougherty.

In June of 1971, St. Joachim's welcomed its new pastor, Father William L. Cotterall, a West Philadelphia native who attended St. Charles Seminary and was ordained June 7, 1941.

Father Fagan remained as pastor emeritus, providing a gentle counsel and comfort to the parish until he died on Oct. 13, 1972.

On June 29, 1978, the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales were given the responsibility of administering to the needs of the parishioners of St. Joachim's. Father Anthony F. Silvestri, O.S.F.S., was appointed pastor. His assistants were Father John J. Bradunas, O.S.F.S., and Father Francis J. McGuire, O.S.F.S.●

HUGHES' CRIME BILL CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, this week, our colleagues will have the opportunity to support a bill that can significantly reduce the rate of crime in each of our communities. H.R. 4481, the Justice Assistance Act of 1981, offers this Congress its best chance to make a difference in reversing the steadily increasing rate of crime that many of us so often lament, yet seldom do anything about.

This legislation, which we have our colleague, BILL HUGHES, to thank for, would provide our State and local governments with \$170 million in fiscal years 1982 and 1983 to combat crime. These funds will not be used to supply local police departments with exotic, expensive, and often unneeded equipment. It will not fund esoteric psychological studies of lefthanded pickpockets. It will give your community funds for proven programs that show results in reducing crime.

The bill will limit the use of these grants to the following categories:

- Community anticrime programs;
- Disruption of commerce in stolen goods and property;
- Arson;
- White collar crime, organized crime, and public corruption;
- Career criminal and witness/victim programs; and
- Several other areas that directly impact on reducing crime.

I know, from speaking with law enforcement officials in my own area—the U.S. Virgin Islands—that this bill would be a tremendous help in reducing crime. I believe that if my colleagues will check with their local police officials and sheriffs that they would find as widespread support for this bill as I did.●

VOLUNTARY HELP FOR 10-YEAR-OLD EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the capacity of the American people to vol-

unteer to help individuals in need is again demonstrated by an event in Scranton, Pa., involving Bobby, a bright and enthusiastic 10-year-old who is a victim of cerebral palsy.

The story of Bobby and his new foster parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Walsh, has been told in a series of articles by Joseph X. Flannery, special writer for the Scranton Times, who has commented:

My instinct when I approach almost any story is to be a skeptic. Accept little on faith is my usual journalistic creed. However, I have to admit that all my cynicism dissolved recently when I met Joseph and Catherine Walsh and heard their appeal for help.

The people, organizations, and businesses of Scranton have set an example in responding voluntarily to help a member of the community, and their actions warrant wide attention. Accordingly, I ask that the following accounts from the January 10, 17, and 21 editions of the Scranton Times be printed in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Scranton Times, Jan. 10, 1982]

COUPLE WITH GROWN FAMILY TO ADOPT HANDICAPPED BOY

(By Joseph X. Flannery)

Joseph M. and Catherine Walsh have raised their family of four children, and like most grandparents their age could begin looking forward to taking things a little easier for the rest of their lives.

Instead, they are taking on the permanent job of raising a 10-year-old child who cannot talk, walk or use his hands.

Love is the key element of this story now unfolding at the modest Walsh home at rear 1320 Wyoming Ave. Unless one understands that love, one cannot comprehend why the Walshes, both of whom are 51, would want to adopt Bobby, a quadriplegic totally dependent upon others for his every need.

Love is also the reason why Mrs. Walsh has begun a campaign to raise the \$5,000 needed to buy Bobby a sophisticated electronic device that would enable him to dramatically expand his already surprising ability to communicate with others.

The Walshes figure the key to a productive life for Bobby is an education. But without communication skills, his education would be limited.

Bobby, despite his physical handicaps, is not mentally retarded in any way. A happy and amazingly well-adjusted child, he used a very fundamental system of communicating to learn to read and do arithmetic at about a third-grade level.

He also has developed some physical skills that have amazed persons who had said the youth would be immobile the rest of his life. From a prone position, he can rise to a kneeling position—a feat that he loves to demonstrate for visitors. Similarly, he has developed some hand and arm control, too, although not enough to change his legal classification as a quadriplegic.

The Walshes currently are Bobby's foster parents and they hope to formalize his adoption by March.

The couple points out the youngster has reached the limits of his education under his present system of communicating. With the new device, however, they say he might some day go on to college.

"This new machine could give Bobby a chance to develop the normal mental abil-

ties God gave him," said Mrs. Walsh. "The alternative is to frustrate him forever," she added.

The machine the Walshes are planning to buy is one of 10 devices now being manufactured by Prentke Romich Co., a firm in Shreve, Ohio, that has a division specializing in equipment for handicapped persons. Called "Express 3," it is an updated version of a communications machine for the handicapped that the company has been producing for years.

Bobby, a victim of cerebral palsy from birth, was an infant in a foundling home when the Walsh family first saw him. One of the Walsh children, Kathy, was a volunteer worker at the home and she fell in love with the tiny tot. In time, she started taking him home for weekends—a step that caused her love affair with Bobby to spread to her parents and three brothers. From that point on, Bobby has been part of their family life.

The child spent a number of years in institutions, with the Walshes being his informal "foster family" that took him into their home for weekends, holidays and other occasions. Finally, 16 months ago, the Walsh couple became the legal foster parents.

"Soon he will be ours," Mrs. Walsh said as Bobby—totally aware of all conversation around him—jumped up and down from his kneeling position to express his joy over the prospect.

Among the institutions Bobby has stayed at is the Home of the Merciful Saviour for Crippled Children in Philadelphia. It was there that he was taught how to communicate through a system of numbers, letters and words that appear on a large wooden tray attached to his wheelchair.

However, the Walshes and those working on his education at the Northeast Educational Intermediate Unit orthopedic classroom at the Easter Seal Building on Scranton-Carbondale Highway, Blakely, feel that he has reached the limits of learning under his present communication system and that the new machine, "Express 3," holds the key to his future progress.

Thus, Mrs. Walsh is busy these days writing letters to persons and organizations that she thinks might be willing to contribute money to a "Bobby Fund" to buy the machine that would enable the child—with the movement of his head—to cause letters, numbers, words and even sentences to be printed and vocalized through a built-in tape recorder.

With this machine, a handicapped person can learn to communicate sufficiently to absorb as much knowledge as his intelligence will permit.

"We don't know how far Bobby could progress, but we want him to have the chance," said Mrs. Walsh. For that reason, she said, she is forgetting her pride and begging people to help.

The Walshes cannot do it themselves. They are a family of modest means and barely get by on Mr. Walsh's job at McKinney Manufacturing Co.

"But I'm going to get this money for Bobby if I have to go to the president of the United States," Mrs. Walsh said.

[From the Scranton Times, Jan. 17, 1982]

CARING STUDENT COLLECTS \$617 FOR BOBBY FUND

(By Joseph X. Flannery)

Dave Hollander, the 19-year-old college student who launched a one-person campaign last week to raise money for the

Bobby Fund, concluded his efforts with a total of \$617 collected.

Hollander solicited the money to help Joseph M. and Catherine Walsh, rear 1320 Wyoming Ave., buy a special electronic machine that they need to enable their foster child, Bobby, 10, to communicate.

Bobby, a victim of cerebral palsy, cannot speak, walk or talk, but the Walshes are adopting him and want to buy the \$5,000 machine that will enable him to "talk" through movements of his head that result in words and sentences to be printed and verbalized.

Hollander, a freshman at Keystone Junior College, read about Bobby in The Sunday Times and decided to start the collection. Without being asked, he started his one-person campaign and collected the \$617, mainly from businesses in the downtown area.

On his final day of collecting, Hollander also toured City Hall with a letter of introduction from Mayor James Barrett McNulty. On that foray, he picked up \$48.

In addition to the cash that Hollander collected, he said that about 25 persons also pledged that they would send donations either to the Walshes or to the Scranton Kiwanis Club, the organization which has undertaken to sponsor the formal fund drive.

Donations to that organization can be sent in care of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce Building, where the Kiwanis office is located.

[From the Scranton Times, Jan. 21, 1982]

FUND CONTINUES TO GROW TO MEET BOBBY'S FUTURE NEEDS

(By Joseph X. Flannery)

During the past two weeks, Catherine Walsh has cried a lot.

The 51-year-old grandmother has shed happy tears, however, because it seems every day brings her more good news.

Mrs. Walsh and her husband, Joseph M., of rear 1320 Wyoming Ave., are the foster parents of 10-year-old Bobby, a cerebral palsy victim who cannot talk, walk or use his hands.

Two weeks ago today, Mrs. Walsh said she was "scared to death" because she and her husband had made a down-payment on a \$5,000 machine that Bobby needed to increase his communicating skills. An anonymous donor had given them \$500 to order the machine, but they didn't have the slightest idea where they would get the rest to pay for it when it arrives in March.

It was then that The Sunday Times told of the couple's plans to legally adopt Bobby, making him their lifetime responsibility, and of their problem of getting money to buy the expensive electronic device that the child needs for his future education and social development.

The rest is a matter of history. In two weeks, over \$10,000 was raised by many persons for the Bobby Fund and donations still are coming into the Walsh home at the rate of about \$200 a day.

This is not "extra" money, however. William Nellis, who is Scranton Kiwanis Club charity chairman and head of its Bobby Fund, has agreed that the first \$5,000 in donations will be used to buy Bobby's communications machine. Then the balance will be put in trust to be used in later years for Bobby's needs.

Over the past two weeks, the Walshes have received hundreds of notes and letters with donations. However, one that was received at their home on Friday with a \$50

donation really touched the emotions of Mrs. Walsh and caused her to shed a few more tears of happiness.

It was from a woman that Mrs. Walsh assumes would not want her name published. But she said that the thoughts in it were "so beautiful" that she wanted to share them with the public.

The writer described herself as a sister of a "special person" who also is named Bobby and who has suffered from a neurological disease that has baffled medical science for most of his 23 years. Now, the letter adds, he is starting to show some improvement.

The letter continued: "God is answering our many prayers. Now this contribution is my simple way of saying thanks. I give it in Jesus' name."

"I believe that while these 'special children' appear very unfortunate to us who are healthy, they do have a special mission to carry out. They are like angels on earth, touching the lives of many persons."

"I will pray for your Bobby and for his loved ones. God bless you."

Mrs. Walsh said that only persons who are close to handicapped persons and love them dearly can relate to each other the way the letter writer expressed her thoughts.

"That's exactly how we feel about our Bobby," she said, adding: "He brings joy into every life he touches."

Donations for the Bobby Fund are being received at the Walsh home in care of the Scranton Kiwanis Club at the Scranton Chamber of Commerce Building.

The largest donations to the fund to date were \$2,400 from the workers and management of McKinney Manufacturing Co. where Mr. Walsh is employed; \$1,500 from Scranton Kiwanis Club and \$500 each from local businessman Ralph Lomma and from an anonymous donor. In addition, Keystone Junior College student Dave Hollander took up a collection among businessmen that netted over \$600; Bell Telephone Co. employees raised \$500 with luncheon and bake sale and county government workers took up a collection that totaled \$500.

Mrs. Walsh also reported that the Dunmore Women's Club held an auction at a meeting last week and raised \$65, with the money being sent by Mary Hiller, and the Greater Green Ridge Neighbors, represented by Brian Quinn, sent \$50. She also reported that La Festa Italiana, the organization which holds a festival every year at the Couthouse Square, has included the Bobby Fund in a group of 11 charities which have been earmarked for donations from the proceeds of last fall's festival.

Mrs. Walsh said that all money that she is receiving is being turned over immediately to Nellis, the Scranton postmaster who deposits it in the special bank account that has already been set up in Bobby's name. "Donors should know that every cent that is given for our Bobby will be used to meet his special needs," she added. ●

A SALUTE TO MY FRIEND, DICK BOLLING

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the late President John F. Kennedy, writing of Senate Republican Leader

Robert A. Taft, said, "Bob Taft never became President of the United States. Therein lies his personal tragedy, and therein lies his national greatness." As a Republican Member commenting on the career of my Democratic friend, the gentleman from Missouri, I will take the liberty to say, "RICHARD BOLLING never became Speaker of the House. It might be for him a personal disappointment, but it cannot diminish the impact he has had on his party and on this House."

Only two Members of the 97th Congress (the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WHITTEN, and my good friend from Illinois, Mr. PRICE), have served here longer than RICHARD BOLLING's 17 terms. Early in this career, he was a protege of Sam Rayburn, learning from that master of the House the nuances of leadership and legislative procedure. Named to the Rules Committee in 1955, Bolling became an advocate of reform and was one of the leaders in the 1961 effort to enlarge the membership of the Rules Committee to make it a more hospitable forum for civil rights and social legislation.

As a student of the House and author of two acclaimed studies of the Congress, RICHARD BOLLING helped to set the agenda for the era of legislative reform which so dominated our attention during the 1970's. As chairman of the Select Committee on Committees in the 93rd Congress, he has been successful in bringing about substantial modernization of our committee system. He played a key role from his post of the House Rules Committee in achieving the agreement necessary to gain passage of the Congressional Budget Act.

An advocate of strong party leadership in Congress, BOLLING, as chairman of the Rules Committee, has sought to make that panel responsive to the needs of his party. Although we have often disagreed over partisan and policy issues, one can only have respect and admiration for DICK BOLLING's zeal and dedication.

Twice in his career RICHARD BOLLING has sought unsuccessfully to enter the ranks of the Democratic floor leadership. Five years ago, he was a candidate for the post of Democratic majority leader. He was defeated, but only after the closest congressional leadership election for either party in this century. That was surely a great disappointment to RICHARD BOLLING; but, as he completes his distinguished congressional career, RICHARD BOLLING should take pride in the fact that the House of Representatives has been changed decidedly because of his work and that it will continue to bear his mark far into the future. It has been a pleasure and an honor to serve with him in the House these 20 years. ●

ADDITIONAL FUNDS NEEDED TO CONTINUE AID TO UNEMPLOYED

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future this House will consider House Joint Resolution 391, emergency legislation to provide \$2.3 billion in supplemental appropriations to aid the States and territories in continuing unemployment compensation benefits. With over 9 percent of our Nation's workforce unemployed, it should come as no surprise to my colleagues that the funds we provided last summer for this purpose under Gramm-Latta II, have run out.

This legislation would provide:

\$1.9 billion to permit the Treasury to make advances to the unemployment trust fund to provide states with resources to pay extended benefits to unemployed workers;

\$133 million for grants to states to cover higher costs of processing and paying an increased number of unemployment insurance claims; and

\$210 million to restore financing for employment security agencies to provide the staff needed to help the unemployed find jobs and administer the requirement that unemployment compensation recipients accept suitable jobs when they are offered.

In my own district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, we have had an unusually high level of unemployment, approaching seven percent of the workforce. Fortunately, our local Department of Labor has sufficient funds at this time to continue its services. However, should our economy continue its present decline we may not always be in such an enviable position.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital and urgently needed legislation.●

REAGAN'S PROPOSED FAMILY PLANNING REGULATIONS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal to require parental notification when teenagers are provided with prescription birth control devices would thrust government into an area of personal privacy where it does not belong. The regulations would also place in needless jeopardy the physical and mental health of our Nation's young people and impose undue stress on their relationships with their families.

I believe that this is another example of the administration's eagerness to legislate morality, to interfere with personal decisions of individuals, and

to inject government into the sensitive and private arena of family life. Instead of removing government from the lives of our citizens and protecting individual rights, the administration seems determined to tell Americans just how they must live their lives. This proposed regulation would use, and abuse, government authority to require codes of personal conduct on all young people and their families, without respect for their individual circumstances and beliefs.

Proposals for mandatory parental notification when teenagers use contraceptives have been rejected by the Congress for good reason. Teenage sexual activity and family planning are sensitive issues that are better handled on an individual basis, without rigid rules. Meaningful family communication and strong family relationships can only be harmed by the administration's prescriptions, however well intended. Because of the delicate nature of this issue, Congress carefully amended title X of the Public Health Service Act last year to "encourage family participation" to the "greatest extent possible". The drafters of this proposed regulation appear to have ignored congressional intent.

The proposed rule will not discourage sexual activity, it will only discourage responsible planning of that activity. It will result in more unintended teenage pregnancies and more abortions. Tragedy is the certain conclusion.

Teenage pregnancy is already an epidemic in this country. A staggering 1.2 million teenagers become pregnant each year, three quarters of them unintentionally. For most, pregnancy at an early age brings nothing but hardship and heartache. The harsh reality of teenage pregnancy often includes limited employment and educational opportunities, hasty and short-lived marriages, welfare dependence, and great health risks. There is no justification for condemning more young people to face this unpromising future.

Family planning activities funded under title X have been tremendously successful in helping to reduce pregnancy rates among sexually active teenagers. In 1979 alone, more than 400,000 unintended pregnancies were averted through the national family planning program. Participation in the program as currently structured is high. However, a recent survey revealed that 25 percent of teenagers currently attending family planning clinics would stop coming if their parents were to be notified. But only 2 percent of these young adults say they will forgo sexual activity.

In our country, the availability of family planning services has improved the quality of human life, strengthened family relationships, and promot-

ed personal responsibility and choice. Let us not deny these services and their valuable benefits to our youth by implementing this ill-conceived regulation.

Last Friday's New York Times printed an editorial on the proposed regulation. I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

SQUEALING ON TEENAGERS

Sex sells jeans, perfume and cars. Conversely, jeans, perfume and cars sell sex. The audience at a raunchy revue is not applauding the costumes, nor do wine and cheese attract the customers to the kind of party that sells "marital aids" instead of Tupperware. The pursuit of a "good sex life" is sanctioned not only by millions of Americans but by the I.R.S., which allows a tax deduction for sex counseling. This is life in the United States.

Now imagine a place in which no one under 18 has ever seen television, movies, newspapers or magazines . . . in which all parents are married, in perpetuity and in bliss . . . in which sexual feelings emerge simultaneously with the taking of wedding vows. This is not life in the United States. Yet much of the nation prefers to treat children as if it were.

The need for that pretense is understandable. Most parents hope their children will delay sexual activity until maturity; many are shattered when they discover otherwise. But 350,000 teen-agers will bear children out of wedlock in 1982. Several hundred thousand others will undergo abortions. Some of these are poor, others affluent; all have been raised in a time of sexual revolution.

Since there is no reason to think this revolution will ever be wholly reversed, there is a national responsibility to insure that it does not consume children and adolescents.

Ideally, teen-agers who want contraceptive advice will feel free to talk to their parents first. But often such discussion is painful, indeed impossible. Family planning services like Planned Parenthood provide a neutral ground in which to talk, and to listen. In 1979, the Alan Guttmacher Institute estimates, such services averted some 400,000 unintended teen-age pregnancies. They might have averted more if their clients had come sooner; most had been sexually active for a year.

Now the Reagan Administration is considering a law to force subsidized family planning agencies to notify the parents whenever teen-agers under 18 seek contraceptive drugs and devices. Parents, they say, should be informed about prescriptions that affect their children's health.

There is no contraceptive, however, that affects an adolescent's health as adversely as pregnancy. Teen-agers are five times as apt to die of pregnancy-related causes as from using the pill. (They are also at the least risk of any age group from the pill.) Nor is there anything more likely to drive teen-agers away from a family-planning agency than the knowledge that it is required to squeal on them.

Most agencies do in fact encourage youngsters to tell their families about the clinic visits, and a majority of the teen-agers do so. But a recent study by the Guttmacher Institute found that a fourth of them would stop applying for prescription contraceptives if their parents had to be notified. Only 2 percent said they would stop sexual activity.

Thoughtful parents have to be saddened by the precocity of adolescent sexual behavior. But what is that sadness compared with the tragedy of a child propelled to child-birth or abortion by Government interference in the counseling program? Weigh these alternatives and see why the best, most loving action a parent can take is to tell the Government to butt out.●

HOLD THE LINE ON COAL R. & D. CUTS

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in President Reagan's proposed fiscal year 1983 budget for the fossil energy research and development program, only \$106.9 million is being allocated with \$91 million of this sum for coal technology development. Last year, the Congress appropriated \$416.9 million for fossil energy research and development programs, which was already a drastic reduction from fiscal year 1981's level of \$1.134 billion.

The reason given for these reductions is that the administration intends to support only long-term, high-risk technology activities. Fitting this description appears to be nuclear technologies. The President's proposed budget for nuclear fission and nuclear

fusion accounts for 87 percent of the total energy technology budget with \$1.4 billion slated for fiscal year 1983.

Last year, when this administration's favoritism toward nuclear energy became apparent, I stated that synthetic fuels development fit into the President's definition of the Federal Government's role in energy research and development. Judging from the state of the synthetic fuels industry today, the private sector certainly does not seem capable of developing these technologies without Federal support. With the decline of this industry, America is losing another opportunity to reduce its dependency on foreign oil.

But surely, it would seem the administration would recognize the importance of basic coal research and development. In consideration of the abundant reserves of coal with which this country is blessed, it would seem prudent to make every effort to facilitate technologies to burn it in the cleanest way possible. While many in the private sector engage in such research, they can never bring new technologies to the commercial stage because the Federal Government is constantly changing the rules of the game.

It takes about a 10-year payback period before an investment in energy research and development will be profitable. Yet, the Clean Air Act can change every 4 years or so and under

these circumstances, the private sector is never certain which technology will be required. For example, when the 1977 Clean Air Act amendments were enacted, they favored rigid discharge electrodes and fabric filters, eliminating the previous use of weighted wire precipitators. Then, in 1979, another technology was eliminated when EPA determined that spray dryers should be used to control sulfur dioxide emissions, making this technology more competitive than wet scrubbers. Thus, the Federal Government actually discourages private investment in coal research and development and therefore, must take up the slack.

One impact of reduced coal technology funding I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention concerns university programs. In a recent letter sent to me by Dr. Dayne Aldridge, director of West Virginia University's Energy Research Center, he stated that—

If all DOE funding were eliminated from our fiscal year 1981 effort, support would be almost halved. Most affected would be projects in fluidized bed combustion, oil and gas and coal characterization. I estimate that 140 less graduate students would have been supported. This translates to 50 to 75 less masters and doctoral graduates per year in areas critical to coal.

Following is a table sent to me by Dr. Aldridge showing the effect of DOE funding on West Virginia University's energy research programs:

EFFECT OF DOE FUNDING ON WVU ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAM—BASED ON ACTIVITY DURING FISCAL YEAR 1981

Area	Funding source				
	State	State other ¹	Federal	DOE ²	Industry
Coal conversion and utilization	\$208,289	\$86,437	\$2,795,335	\$2,616,995	\$580,089
Coal mining and processing	293,919	6,607	2,489,333		148,544
Petroleum and natural gas	1,630	204,195	1,603,638	1,603,638	10,110
Basic research	210,712		1,392,105	896,324	44,000
Alternative energy sources, conservation and education	23,690	771,338	504,477	465,345	153,696
Other	34,259		979,100		5,000
Energy-related health research	3,565		904,991	470,807	
Reclamation and pollution	73,830	19,552	501,043	267,042	145,088
Policy, economic and social issues	54,196	33,487	111,999	23,924	85,000
Energy research and development	106,939				
Administration	69,325				
Energy transportation and transmission	34,427				24,145
Total	1,114,781	1,121,616	11,282,021	6,344,075	1,195,672
					14,714,090

¹ Most of these funds come from DOE but "pass through" a State agency such as the fuel and energy office.

² Figures are a portion of "Federal"—not part of total.

MAJ. GEN. ROLAND DEL MAR

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep loss that I announce to my esteemed colleagues the death, in Washington, D.C. at the age of 73 of Maj. Gen. Roland Haddaway del Mar, U.S. Army, retired, a native of Attica, Ind., brought-up in Winnetka, Ill., who was much loved, ad-

mired, and respected by the Puerto Rican community.

He served in the Pacific during World War II and later in the occupation of Japan.

He also served in Korea, Germany, Italy, and Puerto Rico. He retired in 1966 and received the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star during his military career.

I had the privilege of meeting this soldier and statesman briefly here in Washington some time ago. He was undoubtedly a man of many virtues—

not the least of which was his innate ability to make friends.

He came to Puerto Rico in May 1961 as Commander of the Antilles Command, U.S. Army, Caribbean, and stayed until April 1963. During that short time he established excellent relations with the local community.

One of his first actions was to learn Spanish, which he spoke fluently. He frequently visited remote parts of the island, not only for official inspection missions, but also for personal enjoyment and for speaking engagements

before different military and civilian groups.

During his tour of duty in the Antilles he was named "Commonwealth Boss of the Year" by the Puerto Rican Secretaries Association; and "Man of the Year" by the Public Relations Society of Puerto Rico, for his outstanding achievements in that field. He was also awarded the Puerto Rico National Guard Distinguished Service Medal in recognition of his constant support of the PRARNG. Finally, it was also while commanding the Headquarters Antilles Command—with the rank of brigadier general—that he received his promotion to major general in August 1962.

As a result of this promotion he was reassigned to Fort McNair, in Washington, D.C., as the Director of the Inter American Defense College.

In the Nation's Capital, General del Mar kept in close contact with the Puerto Rican social, cultural, and civic groups, never missing the occasion to attend their many activities. Both the General and Mrs. (Elizabeth) del Mar became immensely popular and well loved in those circles. As a philanthropist, he never forgot Puerto Rico. Through the Del Mar Foundation, left by his father the late Charles del Mar, every year at Christmas time the General sent donations to different charitable and humanitarian groups on the Island.

This man, who learned to enjoy the best of two cultures, was buried at Arlington National Cemetery. He is survived by his wife Elizabeth, his daughter Maureen Braddock, of Alexandria, and a grandson.●

TRIBUTE TO LOIS GRAFF

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, in order to be selected to the all-Ohio School Board, an individual must have proved outstanding service and dedication to the schools and youth of our State. Lois M. Graff, a mother of three as well as a professor at Baldwin-Wallace College, is such a person. Recently it was announced that she will represent the northeast Ohio region.

Twice President of the Parma School Board in the last 11 years, Mrs. Graff's accomplishments also include being a certified public accountant and providing invaluable expertise in developing the first 5-year financial and educational plans of the board.

I salute the Ohio School Board for picking a woman as deserving as Mrs. Graff for this honor.●

RIGHT TO CHOOSE AN ABORTION

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. William Hart from Elk Mountain, Wyo., sent me a speech her youngest daughter, Heidi, age 17, gave in a competition in Wyoming.

It is a speech advocating women's right to choose an abortion.

I urge my colleagues to read it. It is young women like Heidi Hart that will have to bear the consequences on any restrictions of the availability of abortions. If legislation is passed that makes abortions illegal, then Heidi and her generation will have to live out the nightmare of back alley abortions that today they only read about in stories of "way back when."

PRO-ABORTION

"I cannot understand the new view that life begins at conception. If this is true, . . . why is it not customary to hold religious rites for a dead fetus after a miscarriage? Why only after birth? It is obviously a concept trumped up to add righteous clout to the arguments of anti-abortionists."

This is the view held by Katherine Hepburn and me. I feel abortion should remain legal in all aspects, and especially those cases involving rape, possible death of the woman, teen-age pregnancies and incest.

Imagine this: A woman walking home is attacked and raped. Because of this violation of her body, she is impregnated. She has probably also been mentally harmed by this experience. Why should she be harmed more, possibly irrevocably, by having to carry this child given to her by a criminal who took her by force? Wouldn't it be better to save this woman's sanity than to save the child that is not wanted? If she did have this child, it could end up a criminal just like its father. Or worse, it could end up mentally sick because of the stress the mother had to go through during the pregnancy. This child could also end up going from foster home to foster home all through its adolescent life. Wouldn't it be better to save this child from this hell?

Most people condone abortion in cases involving possible death of the woman but why can't they condone it in other cases? I'll tell you why!! Anti-abortionists say that abortion violates some age-old and God-given law. They say this to scare women and harass legislators. But with one look at the history books shows you that they are either lying or are terribly misled with their views.

Until 100 years ago no one punished abortion in the early stages of the pregnancy—not even the Catholics punished it!! Lawrence Lader made the statement in "Abortion" that "the Greek city states and ancient Rome, the foundations of western civilization, made abortion the basis of a well-ordered population policy."

The Christian church gave the fetus a soul, and after 18 centuries of debate the church took the conveniently loose view that the fetus became animated by the rational soul, and abortion became a crime

after only 40 days for a boy, and 80 days for a girl. One problem with this is that no method of sex determination was given.

English common law was fairly tolerant of abortion up until the mother feels the fetus move which usually happens between the fourth and fifth months. In the U.S. for a long time, the common law inherited from England protected the right of abortion in the early stages of pregnancy.

Then, in 1869 Pope Pius IX eliminated the distinction between an animated and non-animated fetus. Since then, the Catholic church has called all abortion murder and punished it severely. Anti-abortion laws were passed in 1803 in England. Then, in 1821, Connecticut punished abortion of a fetus by poison after the fetus had quickened. A succession of laws soon followed which peaked around 1860 in outlawing all abortions except one needed to save the mother.

There were three main reasons abortion suddenly became a crime. The first was logical: abortion was a dangerous operation because of poor conditions and crude methods. The second wasn't quite as good: as biologists began to better understand conception, women began to use better contraceptives. Many countries looked down on this as they needed a higher population to keep up the number of workers in factories and on farms. The third reason is the most dangerous: it is the idea that sex for pleasure is bad, and that pregnancy is the punishment for pleasure.

This last reason is rather chauvinistic and discriminating. Why should the woman be punished alone? What about the man who had the pleasure with the woman? Why isn't he mentioned? People talk as if it was all the woman's fault, but as the saying goes, "it takes two to tango."

Finally in 1973, the Supreme Court took a step toward legalizing abortion. The Court now affirms that the "right of privacy" founded in the 14th Amendment's concept of personal liberty . . . is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy." The Court held that up to the first trimester of pregnancy, the decision to have an abortion may be made solely by the woman and her doctor. After the end of the first trimester, the states power to regulate abortion is limited to the establishment of rules governing where and by whom an abortion may be performed. "It is only after the fetus has reached a point of viability that the state may go so far as proscribing abortion except when necessary to save the mother's life or health."

Now legislators are trying to overrule this court decision. Anti-abortionists say that "abortion violates the sacredness of human life." The legislators are being pushed to gain what they, the anti-abortionists, want. Do you realize how many anti-abortionists are men? What do men know about unwanted pregnancy? Have you known of any pregnant men? I haven't. So how do they know what it's like to have an unwanted child?

One aspect of illegal abortions I don't think many people are looking at is the increase of criminals. Those women who get abortions and those doctors who perform the abortions are murderers thus making for more criminals in our court and prison systems if these people are charged and convicted of their crimes.

Another aspect is the increased number of "back-alley" abortions. These can be done by various people and I will tell you of three.

The first person is the "quack" doctor who can't do an operation right. He might do the abortion right, or he could tear up the woman's insides, perhaps ruining her chances of having a wanted child later on. Or he might end up mutilating both mother and child.

The second person is the mother herself doing the abortion. This has been done by many teen-age girls in high school. There was even one case of a high school's sewer being plugged up. When they pumped out the item that was plugging up the lines, they found a few dead, aborted babies. Sickening, isn't it?! Yet this could begin again if abortion is made illegal. Some adult women have given themselves abortions. One such woman died because she bled to death after she cut open her stomach to take out the baby. Is this what you want? Women killing themselves because of an unwanted child? It's not right!!! Abortion should be kept legal to save the women instead of them killing themselves!!!

The third person could be the woman's boyfriend. He might do the abortion right, but how many women have skilled surgeons for boyfriends? He could also end up killing both the woman and the child making for two possible counts of murder.

Maybe we should all sit back and rationally look at all aspects of abortion. There could be some compromise that both sides could reach. I, however, would still be for abortion in all aspects no matter what! Abortion should be kept legal and a woman's right to control her body. Just think of all the women dying because of self-inflicted abortions or abortions done by unskilled people. Do you want this? Is this what the world would be like? I think abortion would stay legal and that people should leave the government alone so they can work on more important things.●

THE AGONIES OF IRELAND: WHO MAKE UP THE IRA

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House to the continuing series of articles published late last year by the Philadelphia Inquirer on "The Agonies of Ireland."

Again, I share your view that this series prepared by that very distinguished newspaper does give the American reader a balanced and accurate understanding of the problem in Northern Ireland.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 11, 1981]

AGONIES OF IRELAND: WHO MAKE UP THE IRA?

(By Michael Pakenham)

"I was born in the Bogside. . . . Always, we've got the tail end of everything. . . . I am at least 2,400 years old. The British must leave. There'll be no consummation of the marriage of Catholics and Protestants as long as the British are here."

That is the voice of a youth worker, father of a large family. Among his older children are a lawyer and other profession-

als. The Bogside, where his home is, is a sprawling area of mostly public housing, comfortable and solid by the standards of American areas of comparable poverty.

It is the largest and most turbulent Catholic residential area of the ancient city which Catholics call Derry and Protestants, the government of Northern Ireland and road maps call Londonderry—and have for more than 300 years. In Derry, unemployment is 33 percent among males, 17 percent among females.

He is a practical man, a prudent and loving one. He is careful to tell a visitor that he is opposed to violence, to killing, and thus to the actions of the Provisional Irish Republican Army. (Though technically sometimes referred to as the PIRA, since there is really no "Official" IRA anymore, it is commonly referred to as the IRA and is called "Provos" and "Provisionals" by both friends and foes.) He is a man of dignity, with a job and his freedom in jeopardy should he declare himself to be with the IRA, which he does not.

If an outsider is prudent and curious and will deal with the carefully coded legalisms which stand between explanation and confession, active members and leaders of the IRA are accessible in Northern Ireland, and eager to talk. Altogether there are, by government estimates, 600 of them; by more generous assessments, perhaps 2,000. But what is more revealing than their carefully considered statements is where they come from and why they come. It is that well-spring of rage which the youth worker speaks of:

"The problem of the Catholic population of Northern Ireland is that of knowing the British must go but still saying: 'Oh, what will happen if they go?' I believe that the acceptance of responsibility is the only avenue to growth, personal or communal. . . . We've got to go through an agony of rebirth."

Since the Catholic civil rights movement began in 1968, he tells his visitor, he has been arrested 30 times by the police, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), or by the British army. He has been knocked unconscious and hospitalized twice. In Derry today, the RUC has substantially replaced the British army as the main policing force, and the RUC's three top officials there are Catholic. That, he says, has not changed anything very much.

In the 1950s, when he was young, he relates, he helped form the first credit union in Northern Ireland.

"We had no hope, no vision. The Catholic politicians had accepted their subservient roles. We all felt powerless. Individually, people had no say. With the credit union, we felt we should build our own houses and create our own jobs, and not be subservient."

As he talked, he brought in tea and little sweet biscuits and worked with his hands at the muscles of his lower back, now always painful, he says, since a day troops attacked a demonstration he was marching in.

"Before free [secondary] education in 1947, very few Catholics became educated," he said, making a case that the Provo movement is a new and modern thing. "Then a cultural matrix began to be formed. It failed as a civil rights movement. Idealism is a very narrow plateau. Attempts to implement reforms which could have happened in hours took months. Denial of civil rights was a smokescreen over the real objectives of the Protestants with wealth and power—to hold on to power."

Today, he works in a youth program, paid, he knows, by tax monies of which more come from England than from Northern Ireland.

"The British must pay, so long as they're here. The kids are the only hope." He speaks, with what he believes is dispassionate conviction, of the inevitability of the movement among those youths, and of its perils: "The kids are politically sophisticated. They learn quickly how to manipulate the British soldier on the street. But that's a dead end. And the tragedy of that is that an important, visionary political consciousness can die with that and nothing more."

It is clear that to him that would be a grave loss. It also is clear, he says, that there is much to keep the vision alive: "Here, there's a great deal of meaninglessness in unemployment. But every kid around here is going to be part of the revolution, if for nothing else than not to have to say in the future 'I wasn't part of it.' This is the last battle of Irish independence. No family here could put its hands on its heart and say my kid is not a part of the IRA."

There are other voices. There are 478,000 Catholics in Northern Ireland, most of them polarized against their more than one million Protestant neighbors. No one can say how many share the vision of that Derry youth worker. For many, it is dangerous to speak. For others, it is too painful. For many more, not on a breaking edge of the conflict like Derry's Bogside, life simply goes on, and living can be pleasant and prosperous.

It is clear not every Catholic agrees. The voices of Belfast, which with a population of 417,000 (Derry's is 85,000), is the largest city in Northern Ireland, are different. There, among bomb-scarred, stone-shattered, graffiti-smudged, brick rowhouse Catholic neighborhoods—many mere yards from Protestant areas distinguished only by the words of the slogans on the walls—there are different kinds and intensities of bitterness, of fear and yearning. There are poor Protestants, more in Belfast than anywhere else in Northern Ireland. But there also is far more evidence there of the Protestant economic advantage under which Catholics historically have been denied equal access to prosperity—and still are.

In Belfast also, claiming to speak for the great majority of Catholics, there are men like Gerry Fitt. He is a native of Belfast, in his own words, a "working class socialist" for his entire adult life, and one of the two Catholic members of the London Parliament from Northern Ireland (the other 10 are Protestants).

Gerry Fitt has won elections for a quarter of a century, and lives in the neighborhood where he was born, on the Antrim road. His house is scarred by a dozen years of attacks. Its tiny, concrete back yard is protected from bombs by a sloping screen of steel mesh. Standing beneath it, he says:

"This house had been under attack from Loyalists (Protestant militants) in 1968 and '69. But then when the Provos began their shooting war, I was equally opposed to them. . . . I believe they cannot unite Ireland by this campaign. I believe that they have shamed Ireland in the eyes of the world because of the atrocious, vicious murders they've carried out in the name of Ireland. They've brought devastating tragedy into the lives of many, many people."

"I myself have carried nearly a hundred coffins to various graveyards throughout Northern Ireland, victims of the IRA and the Protestant paramilitaries. I make no dis-

tion. . . . I can speak of the IRA because I am a Catholic myself, and I want to see a united Ireland, and it is they I am bitterly opposed to because they have put off the day when a united Ireland could have been foreseen. . . .

"The first British soldier ever to be shot dead [on Feb. 6, 1971] was shot just up the road there. Gunner Robert Curtis. I heard the shot that killed him. I came out and denounced that killing . . . all the murders, whether it be the Provos or the Loyalists or anyone else. I sent four wreaths out to people last week. I've got a running account with a florist to send wreaths to people who have been murdered. . . . It's a hell of a sad commentary, you know, to have a running account."

But, surely, Gerry Fitt was asked, the IRA are socialists, as is he?

"They're not socialists at all, though sometimes they would claim to be. They're fascists."

And, he was asked, what if the Provisionals' dream of a swift British withdrawal of forces were achieved?

"The Catholics in Belfast would be murdered. . . . If you live in Derry or Strabane, it's very easy to get up and say, 'Brits out! Brits out!' If there's any kind of trouble you can run over the border. But if you live where I'm living, you're caught. The Catholics would get slaughtered in Belfast. It would be a whole holocaust." (Belfast is more than an hour's hard drive from the border.)

So Gerry Fitt, M.P., believes in carrying coffins, sending wreaths and pleading. He believes fervently in gradualism, in bringing the two communities of Northern Ireland together, and together with the Irish Republic, by painstaking economic and legal and institutional means. In that, he believes, the bitterest enemy of Irish unification, Irish dignity and human survival is the IRA. And in that, the supporters of the IRA believe him to be more the enemy perhaps than the British—if there is a difference.

In Derry, a mother with two sons in prison for membership in the IRA and alleged acts of terrorism speaks of Gerry Fitt with scorn that strains her loving nature. "So long as the Protestants have the British Army at their backs," she says, speaking specifically of Mr. Fitt's position, "they'll never change. The British established a dependency among many Catholics, as well as Protestants. It's a total dependency, a subservience. That's Gerry's problem. To break away from it would be fairly tough. But then we're talking about the birth of a new country. Things would be at the melting point."

One of her sons, younger than the two in prison, joins in the conversation. He too is warm, and astonishingly mature and informed for a teenager. He doesn't agree with everything his mother says, and shows no hesitation in declaring the differences. On one thing they agree, and need spend no words to prove; their total affection for each other and the rest of their close, articulate family.

His mother said she would not lead her sons into the ranks of the IRA. But she accepts the fact that none of them would tell her of their involvement since "both their lives and their hearts would be in peril." They talk of the young man's older brothers, and visits to them during the IRA hunger strike and before.

"The more you suffer," the young man says, his voice even and expressive, almost musical, a peaceful voice, "the more com-

sionate you become. The prisoners don't hate the jailers. The relatives hate the jailers more than the prisoners do. The only fear, the great fear, among the prisoners is that something will happen to their relatives and weaken their resolve and their support."

His mother waits until he is done, and speaks of her older sons and their companions in prison and in arms. "The hunger strike was effective," she says, "after 12 years on the way forward. The politicians had never taken us seriously." Her voice grows vibrant, rising quickly with a smile. "We are living in a very exciting period. In the future, historians will look back and say this was the turning point in Irish history."

If such a turning point is imminent, everyone in Ireland except the IRA's supporters today agree what the likely result will be: the slaughter of thousands—or tens of thousands—of Irish, Catholics and Protestants alike. They will be victims of a mutually genocidal civil war precipitated as spiraling terrorism paralyzes all hope of reconciliation.

(From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 13, 1981)

THE AGONIES OF IRELAND: THE IRA—WHAT IS IT?

In its own terms, today's IRA is the "military" arm of the Provisional Sinn Féin (literally in Irish, or Gaelic: "Ourselves Alone") party. The Provisionals broke away from the less violent "official" Sinn Féin in 1969 and 1970. Thus today, the only significant organization is the Provisional party and its Provisional Irish Republican Army. Though sometimes designated PIRA, it is commonly called the IRA or the "Provos." Its members live and function in both the Irish Republic and Northern Ireland and, significantly, elsewhere.

The original Sinn Féin traced its roots to the ultranationalist movement that was active, and ultimately dominant, in the rebellion that led to the beginning of Irish independence in the 1916-22 period. The IRA had conducted periodic campaigns of violence from the 1920s through the early 1960s.

The Provisionals' roots are deeply set in their passionately declared sense of that history and are profusely nourished by the blood of it. Their fundamental, avowed purpose is to drive all residue of British presence off the island of Ireland and to achieve political and cultural unity and independence.

Both in the IRA's sense of history and its most purposeful strategies, it is fundamentally important to its leaders and members to behave and appear to be recognized as an army. The essence of its self-perception is that Provisional Sinn Féin is the destined government of the legitimate Irish nation. It claims to be devoted to the yet-unfulfilled revolutionary commitment, and thus its military wing is said to be fighting a war, rather than conducting terrorism.

From that derives the insistence that members imprisoned by police authorities in both Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic be accorded "political status"—the internationally established rights of prisoners of war, in strong contrast to the rights of criminals as established by domestic law.

That is what its leaders and members, in public and private statements, say of themselves and their purpose. In pursuit of it, the IRA and a splinter group that calls itself the Irish National Liberation Army have claimed responsibility, since 1970, for

shootings and bombings—in Northern Ireland, the Irish Republic and Britain—that accounts for hundreds of deaths and the maiming of thousands of persons.

What is the IRA's purpose? Since it is an outlawed, and thus secret, organization in both the Irish Republic and Northern Ireland, that is sometimes elusive, and passionately controversial. But to take public statements by two senior leaders of the IRA's political front:

Ruairi O. Bradaigh, president of Provisional Sinn Féin, asked whether he was talking about the kind of parliamentary democracy that exists now in Dublin, said: "No. We're talking about a much more democratic system. We would like to see the key industries coming under public control—those that are essential to the life of the community, like banking and finance and so forth. Beneath that, we would like to see a wide range of worker-owned cooperatives in agriculture, industry and distributive trade. And we also see room for private enterprise, but not as great as a role as at present."

Danny Morrison, Provisional Sinn Féin's director of publicity, speaking at an annual party conference in Dublin on Oct. 31, asked delegates rhetorically: "Who here really believes we can win the war through the ballot box?" Then, after a dramatic pause, he raised his arms high and answered himself: "But will anyone here object if, with a ballot paper in this hand and an Armalite [rifle] in this hand, we take power in Ireland?"

The British government, including police and military forces in Northern Ireland, are implacably opposed to the IRA, of course. But what of others? Is the Provos' cause not that of the government and people of the Irish Republic, serving the aspirations for a united Ireland?

In the words of the present and previous two prime ministers of the republic, coming from both the major political parties:

Dr. Garret FitzGerald, present prime minister and leader of the Fine Gael (literally, "Race of Gaels") party: "The Provisional Sinn Féin does not recognize our government or our courts. They seek to establish a military dictatorship in this country." And, speaking to the Irish Parliament on Nov. 17, after the IRA's assassination of the Rev. Robert Bradford, a Protestant member of the British Parliament for Northern Ireland, Dr. FitzGerald said: "The IRA has once again shown its utter contempt for human life and for the Democratic process. . . . Its true attitude to democracy and freedom was summed up by a recent statement of an IRA spokesman who, when asked by an interviewer for a foreign newspaper about the wishes of the people in this part of the country concerning an aspect of reunification, replied: 'We call the shots. We don't really give a damn what they want.'"

Charles J. Haughey, Dr. FitzGerald's predecessor as prime minister and now leader of the opposition Fianna Fáil (literally "Soldiers of Destiny") party: "All but a tiny minority understand that violence can never bring a solution and that it serves only to perpetuate division and hatred."

Jack M. Lynch, Mr. Haughey's predecessor, speaking as prime minister in 1978: "The terrorist activities of the Provisional IRA are making it impossible to bring [solutions] about. Their activities are, on the contrary, driving people more and more apart. We condemn their cowardly attacks on human lives and property which cause terror and disgust to the overwhelming ma-

majority of all Irish men and Irish women. . . . We as a government will employ the full resources of security and of the law available to us in pursuing and bringing to justice those who engage in violence and who embark on a course of savagery like blowing innocent children to bits on their way to school.

Those represent the main political voices in the Irish Republic. But what about the Catholic Church, the moral leadership of the overwhelming predominance of Irish men and women in the republic and of almost one-third of the population of Northern Ireland?

More than a decade ago, on Sept. 12, 1971, the five Roman Catholic bishops of Northern Ireland, including Cardinal William Conway, primate of all Ireland, issued a joint statement, saying in part: "In Northern Ireland at the present time there is a small group of people who are trying to secure a united Ireland by the use of force. One has only to state this fact in all its stark simplicity to see the absurdity of the idea. Who in his sane senses wants to bomb a million Protestants into a united Ireland? . . . This is the way to postpone a really united Ireland until long after all Irish men and women now living are dead."

Then, on Nov. 20, this year, Cardinal Tomas O. Flaherty, archbishop of Armagh and the current primate of all Ireland, put out a statement saying, "Most of the murders have been claimed by the IRA. . . . Participation in the evil deeds of this or any other paramilitary organization which indulges in murder, wounding, intimidation, kidnapping, destruction of property or other forms of violence is a mortal sin which will one day have to be accounted for before God in judgment."

Bishop Edward Daly of Derry wrote in a pastoral letter on Nov. 22 that "no member of our church can remain a member and at the same time remain a member of any organization that decides of its own accord to perpetuate cold-blooded murder as a central part of its strategy, whatever the motives, whatever the ideal."

From afar in America, or among the young in Ireland, north and south, who are unemployed and have little hope for a sense of purpose otherwise, the IRA can—and does—sometimes seem an enticingly romantic band of brothers, dedicated to a noble cause. Even discounting everyone connected with the British government, and every Protestant, it is hard to find support for that romantic, benevolent view among Irish people today.

There is support for the IRA, of course. Irish people who are hard-headed realists—whether they support the IRA or not—recognize that its support is based on a yearning for a civil war that first would "defeat" the Protestants and then turn south to "defeat" the present political forces there in favor of a revolutionary regime.

Beyond ideological judgments, that is a very improbable eventuality. By and large the Irish people are deeply committed to democracy and are far from radical, although economic discrimination by Protestants has radicalized significant numbers of Catholics in the North.

Meanwhile, it is the Irish, Catholic as intensely as Protestant, who suffer from the effects of the IRA's terrorism, and the equally murderous terrorism of the Protestant paramilitaries. If there is to be peace and unity on the island of Ireland, it will only be delayed, or denied, by butchery, polarization or genocidal civil war. ●

A TRIBUTE TO W. FRANK MISHOE

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, the true measure of a human being in today's world is not the accumulated worldly assets that person has gathered during a lifetime, but the lives he has touched, the assistance he has lent, the dedication with which he has been motivated.

It is with deep sorrow that South Carolina and the Sixth Congressional District has lost a true friend, a dedicated humanitarian, a man who offered himself in service to the people he loved.

Recently, my friend and adviser, former Senator W. Frank Mishoe of Greeleyville, S.C., passed away at age 62. In those six decades, this man created a vast wake of service to his fellow human beings. He served as a member of the South Carolina Assembly for 6 years and was former mayor of Greeleyville.

A native of Williamsburg County, which will long bear his mark in its social, civil, and economic environments, Mr. Mishoe additionally offered his massive knowledge and expertise to the South Carolina Wildlife Department, where he served as a State commissioner from 1966 to 1968.

This great Nation of ours was founded and will be perpetuated by leaders who willingly and aggressively seek out the opportunities for service to their community, State, and Nation. Among that list of leaders will be the name of W. Frank Mishoe. ●

DEFENSE POSTURE STATEMENT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has now produced his first posture statement on U.S. defenses.

It is very disappointing.

This Secretary's annual posture statement—which is supposed to be the definitive statement of a coherent defense policy—looks like it was drafted by a dozen people working in separate cubicles, and then just stapled together.

It just does not hang together.

In the first section, the Secretary debunks a number of lingering myths, such as those about fighting 1½ wars and 2½ wars. But having swept the myths into the dustbin of history, he fails to provide any philosophical un-

derpinning for the Weinberger approach to defense.

I fear there is no philosophy.

One purpose of the annual posture statement is to take policymaking through a formalized analysis of what the threat is to the United States, then to frame the philosophical response to that threat and then to translate the theory into a defined force structure and the defined force structure into a specific budget.

This posture statement, however, simply lists alleged Soviet threats in one section and then lists proposed American forces in another. There is no indication of how the Pentagon got from one to the other. This gives every indication that the two were treated in isolation, which is the worst possible way to structure our defenses. It leaves defense planning largely to the tender mercies of whatever bureaucracy within the Pentagon is the best in-fighter.

What do the planned additional air wings provide in terms of military effectiveness? How do those air wings address the threats posed by our opponents. Or how do the air wings address the threats talked about in the posture statement itself?

You will not find the answers to any of these fundamental questions in this year's posture statement.

The audience for the posture statement is, officially, the Congress, the press, and the public. In truth, the audience for the posture statement is the military itself. Drafting the posture statement forces internal disputes to the top where they can be tackled by the civilian and military leadership of the Defense Establishment. It is an intellectual exercise, a very important intellectual exercise. From the congressional standpoint the key issue is not so much, "What is the policy?" but, "Do they have a policy? Do they know what they are talking about? Does it all hang together?"

The answer this year, for the first time, is "No."

The administration is asking for the biggest and fastest peacetime defense buildup since 1940. More than ever it is important that the various pieces of the defense buildup fit together.

But Secretary Weinberger and those in charge at the Pentagon apparently have not taken this whole exercise very seriously. Judging by the uneasiness in Congress over the size of the deficit and defense spending, they may come to regret that decision. ●

MEDFORD CORP. COPING WITH CALAMITY IN OUR NATION'S TIMBER INDUSTRY

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following article appearing in Portland's Willamette Week newspaper. This story describes how a creative and farsighted firm, the Medford Corp., is coping with the calamity in our Nation's timber industry.

Oregon today faces economic disaster. Unemployment in the State is near 12 percent—only Michigan and Ohio have higher unemployment rates. The unemployment rate where the Medford Corp. is located—Medford, Ore.—is well over 14 percent.

Like every other timber operator in the State, the Medford Corp. must overcome two highly counterproductive Federal policies. The blame for the first, the lack of a consistent timber sales program, can be placed at the door of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For years, regardless of what party was in power, OMB has failed to recognize the most basic fact about the timber industry—that you do not harvest timber the same year it is put up for sale. A typical timber sale in the Northwest takes at least 2 years to complete. When the housing market has been down, OMB decides that there is no need to put additional supply on the market. When housing shoots up, OMB decides to increase the timber sales program to meet the new demand. Unfortunately, this pattern insures that supply will never meet demand. This budgetary roller coaster causes tremendous dislocation in the industry, as experienced in the mid-1970's and as will be the case over the next 5 years.

The second obstacle to economic recovery is our current Jeckle-and-Hyde housing policy. Housing starts have been cut in half from just 1 year ago and those associated with the housing industry, not just those in Oregon, are losing their jobs.

While Federal rules have been modified to allow construction industry pension funds to be invested in mortgages the administration has proposed to phase out FHA and GNMA (Government National Mortgage Association) mortgage insurance. This would devastate what remains of the housing industry because it would destroy an effective program of Government-backed mortgages which are priced lower than mortgage rates.

Industry and working people look to the Congress today to salvage a desperate situation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What the Medford Corp. is doing is ingenious in the face of current housing policies.

This firm has made a commitment to do whatever is necessary to stay in business so that, when housing does make a comeback, there will be a place where Oregonians can find jobs again.

The firm should be commended for its ingenuity. Of course, not every timber firm can do this. Workers in most of the rest of the industry look to the administration to make a course correction in economic policy—or to the Congress, if the administration fails to do so:

[From the Willamette Week, Dec. 22-28, 1981]

MEDFORD CORP.'S KITCHEN COUNTER

(By Janet Dole)

It's no secret that times are tough for the forest-products industry. In these days of high interest rates and record-low housing starts, mere survival is of paramount importance for an industry that has historically been closely and vitally linked with the ups and downs of the housing industry. But Medford Corp.—a medium-sized forest-products company based in Medford—hopes to do more than survive. Leave the hand wringing and anxious waiting to other companies, because Medford Corporation is planning the biggest expansion in its 49-year history, building a \$50 million plant in the Republic of Ireland to manufacture medium-density fiberboard.

The fiberboard is used in furniture and cabinet making and, unlike the lumber and plywood products, in which Medford Corporation has specialized, it is much less affected by the cyclical nature of the American housing market. By using its own resources more efficiently (fiberboard is made from formerly wasted wood chips), tapping into new ones (the Irish plant will use Irish trees), and expanding capacity to sell a product that isn't dependent on building new houses, Medford Corporation is balancing the boom-and-bust nature of the wood-products business. It is a strategy economists call "counter-cycling."

Medford Corporation isn't the only forest-products company working on counter-cycling. Louisiana-Pacific and Potlatch have recently started making waferboard, a building product made from flaked poplar and cottonwood that resembles plywood but is much cheaper to make. Bohemia Lumber specializes in laminated I-beams. A number of firms are paying more attention to paper products; Crown-Zellerbach is building a plant in Portland that will produce "non-woven fabrics" (the material from which disposable hospital gowns are made) and Potlatch is making "bleached paperboard" for frozen-food containers and milk cartons.

But Medford Corporation's diversification may be the most timely and successful of the lot. And it's nothing really new to a company distinguished for its willingness to expand creatively for the last 20 years. Since the early 1960s, Medford Corporation's undertakings have shifted from a preponderance of lumber products to include wood products such as plywood and veneer. More recently it has added kitchen cabinets (its Diamond Industries is one of the top kitchen-cabinet makers in the country) and medium-density fiberboard. A \$13.5 million fiberboard plant built in 1975 has become one of Medford Corporation's most profitable

February 9, 1982

operations, producing 90 million square feet of three-quarter-inch fiberboard each year (making it one of the top three producers in the world) and accounting for over a quarter of 1980's pretax profits.

Medium-density fiberboard is a reconstituted wood product akin to particle board but with many of the qualities of solid wood. Its ability to be machined and to hold screws make it especially suitable for furniture making. When Medford Corporation announced its plans to build a fiberboard plant six years ago, the venture was viewed as daring because the product was relatively new and hardly recognized by the furniture and cabinet making industries. Since then, the fiberboard has come to enjoy wide acceptance, selling well in America and in European countries such as Germany, France and the United Kingdom, where furniture making is an important industry.

This comprehensive approach to the uses of wood has given Medford Corporation a flexibility that is becoming increasingly important as profits from its "solid-wood side"—basic products such as lumber and plywood—decline. Net income is down by over \$4 million for the first three quarters of 1981 compared with the first three quarters of 1980, from \$5,358,348 to \$1,306,438—a decline of 75 per cent. Earnings went from \$2.17 per share to 53 cents. The company's response has been to lay off about 17 per cent of its work force—260 employees out of 1,500—and to close its sawmill until conditions improve. Even the Forest Service's decision to extend contracts to harvest Forest Service timber for another two years didn't help matters, since Medford Corporation had already fulfilled 98 percent of its contractual agreements when the extensions were announced in mid-October. If it had known in advance, the company could have harvested more heavily from its own 88,251-acre tree farm instead of using the comparatively expensive Forest Service trees.

Although it has been exporting roughly 25 percent of its fiberboard to Europe, Medford Corporation had not considered manufacturing it there, and certainly not in Ireland, until it was contacted by the government of the Republic of Ireland. If forests in Ireland strike you as a little unlikely, your sentiments are probably similar to those at Medford Corporation when the company was first approached. Apparently, thanks to the efforts of farsighted foresters 30 years ago, Ireland has over a million acres of Sitka spruce, Ponderosa pine and Douglas fir that are ready to be thinned. The Irish government, seeking to use its maturing resource as well as boost its flagging economy, considered a variety of choices, including pulp and paper mills and round-log exports, before concluding that fiberboard manufacturing would meet the twin goals with the least disruption to the environment.

Medford Corporation executives are still not sure what attracted Ireland to their corporation out of the 20 or so medium-density fiberboard producers that exist in the world, but contend that the quick and smooth start of their Medford plant in 1975 may have helped. They also speculate that the company's relatively small size made them a less unwieldy partner than a Weyerhaeuser or a Louisiana-Pacific (corporations the Irish government probably also considered). Medford Corporation's President Robert Medford thinks it likely that the Irish saw an example of its fiberboard and were impressed. "After all, we're No. 1 in the world in quality," he says.

It took Medford Corporation a year of careful study before the decision to go ahead was announced in January, but it was a decision made in the light of some pretty powerful incentives from the Irish government. The final cost of the plant is estimated to be close to \$50 million, but that will be offset by sizable capital grants and irresistibly low interest rates. Medford Corporation will be dealing with the Bank of Ireland, which is able to offer interest rates ranging from close to zero to up to 4 percent because it, in turn, is dealing with a government that is bending over backward to encourage this sort of expansion. For instance, there's Section 84, "comparable to our bond system," according to Medford Corporation's Vice-President of Finance Richard N. Ransdell, under which the bank will receive money directly from the government. There's also a policy of allowing the bank to claim 100 percent depreciation in the first year on equipment it subsequently leases to Medford Corporation; both schemes will enable the bank to offer attractive interest rates.

In addition, the Irish government will make direct capital grants to Medford Corporation, based on a scale that's geared to the number of Irish citizens the new plant will employ. It will also pick up the tab for the transportation to and from Medford, and the training, of the Irish workers who will receive their instruction at the Oregon plant. An exemption from all income tax through the year 2000 and a long-term timber agreement ensuring the Corporation will have a steady supply of raw material also helped sweeten the deal.

Ireland's geographical position and its membership in the European Common Market were compelling considerations. A base in Ireland will greatly enhance Medford Corporation's ability to penetrate the European market. The biggest markets are now in the United Kingdom, Germany, the Benelux countries (Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg), and France. At present Medford Corporation must pay duty charges that run from 11 to 15 percent on its European deliveries. Since Ireland belongs to the European Common Market, the company's Irish subsidiary will be able to ship throughout Europe and enjoy duty-free access. Although the European market is growing, Ted Bauer, marketing manager of the fiberboard group, says, "We're not enjoying all the sales we would like," because of the strengthening dollar, which has increased by about 35 percent in value relative to French francs and Dutch guilders, and thus has driven up the price of fiberboard. Once the company begins exporting from Ireland it will be selling in European currencies, which should make fiberboard more affordable.

Higgins views the move to Ireland as fitting in with an "international mode with respect to company growth." Already an active exporter to Australia, Europe and Pacific Rim countries, Medford Corporation plans to increase its exports when the Irish plant starts producing in the late summer of 1983. The European market will be served by the Irish plant (which will have about the same capacity as the Medford plant), thus freeing more of the Medford-produced fiberboard for shipment to the Pacific Rim.

Medford Corporation officials predict that the housing slump will turn around in 1983, and hope their strategy of diversifying into such products as medium-density fiberboard and kitchen cabinets will see them through. If it works, it's a lead other forest-products firms are likely to sit up and notice. ●

COMMENTS ON EL SALVADOR

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, when I traveled to Central America a little over a year ago to investigate conditions surrounding the conflict in El Salvador, I believe that many of my constituents back home would have little interest in this mission or might even resent my spending time in an area far from home. Since I have become involved in speaking out against the Reagan administration's policies in Central America, I have been pleasantly surprised by the interest and concern showed by many of my constituents in Delaware County. I have come to believe that many Americans have a strong interest in human rights, justice, and progressive American policy in El Salvador.

An example of this is the thoughtful letter I recently received from James J. Laverty, of Upper Darby, Pa. I would like to thank Mr. Laverty and the many other citizens who have lent encouraging support to my efforts to draw attention to the problems of El Salvador and American policy there. Mr. Laverty's letter follows:

183 MARLBOROUGH ROAD,

Upper Darby, Pa., February 5, 1982.

HON. ROBERT EDGAR,

U.S. Congressman,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDGAR: I would like to congratulate you and lend my support for your efforts on Tuesday (2/2/82) regarding the President's certification that the Salvadoran Government has made progress in reforms of human rights in El Salvador. Your questioning of our government's capability of monitoring such progress is quite to the point, as was Chairman Barnes' comments in which he stated that he knew of no evidence that reforms were being carried out. In fact, any evidence that is presented to the public by the press and other groups is quite to the contrary.

In early 1981 I had the opportunity to listen to a number of people representing such groups as the Maryknoll Fathers, and the American Friends who had recently returned to the United States from El Salvador. The evidence they presented indicated that the military government was quite repressive: people were taken from their homes for questioning who just never seemed to return; others just disappeared; the archbishop of San Salvador was killed while making his sermon at Sunday mass; and one of the presenters, a Maryknoll priest, had routinely been arrested and beaten.

More recently, I have been following accounts of Salvadoran life documented by journalists of the New York Times. Without recounting these articles in depth, which range from the plight of refugees and village life, to motives and activities of the "rebels" in certain areas of the country. I feel compelled to tell you that I, for one, am convinced that the interpretation of the facts in El Salvador by the Reagan admin-

stration, and in particular by Secretary Haig, present a distorted picture of the facts.

As you know, appearing before the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Latin American Affairs on Tuesday, Thomas O. Enders, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs referred to the rebels in El Salvador as a "violent minority" who may capture El Salvador. If this happened, according to Mr. Enders, soon major strategic interests such as the Panama Canal, sea lanes and oil supplies would be threatened.

I take issue with these statements. From all accounts which I have read and heard, and from a good number of years of study of the third world, the "violent minority" in El Salvador has been at the top of the pyramid. The Salvadoran people are a majority, and they have been repressed politically and economically by a very small percentage of the population—those who own the land and control the wealth in that country. As far as threatening American strategic interests, I'm sure that the concerns of the Salvadoran people are more likely to be occupied by such things as their fear of being taken from their homes, and the ever-present problem of feeding their families.

Mr. Enders went on to point out that if the United States "acted decisively now" we could prevent the development of a future threat from the neighboring countries in Latin America. If we didn't act, he implied, the future could well bring "more Cubas: totalitarian regimes so linked to the Soviet Union that they become factors in the military balance, and so incompetent economically that their citizens' only hope becomes that of one day migrating to the United States."

Congressman Edgar, the fact is that for many Salvadorans migration to the U.S. is their only hope TODAY! It is ironic that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, acting on a State Department recommendation, treats Salvadorans not as refugees but as illegal aliens "and therefore they are deported." Recent figures from Immigration and Naturalization indicate that every month close to 1,000 Salvadorans are being sent back to El Salvador. This policy contradicts both the United Nations' 1967 Protocol Related to the Status of Refugees, which the United States has signed, and the United States Refugee Act of 1980. On this score, Congressman Edgar, the American people and the members of the House subcommittee have been fed some things by Mr. Enders that don't easily wash down.

But Mr. Enders' comments carry with them a theme which has been characteristic of the Reagan administration, and in particular of Secretary Haig, which is to view the entire world in East-West terms overlooking a rather large percentage of the world's population living on rather a large percentage of the earth's land—the third world. I contend that these people have their own interests, and among them, is to be treated with dignity by the super powers on the basis of those interests.

El Salvador, as I'm sure you're aware, is not the first country with whom the United States has erred. I do not believe that President Reagan nor Secretary of State Haig are acutely trying to dupe the American people. On the contrary, I feel their actions, in particular with El Salvador, have been based not on deception but on ignorance. This ignorance is based on ideological dogma which overlooks the reality of things.

Despite Secretary of State Haig's allegation that the Soviet Union and Cuba are responsible for the guerrilla movement there, Russians and Cubans are not dying in El Salvador, but instead those who make up the majority of the population, and their deaths are at the hands of the "violent minority" in control!

That people are revolting against this repression should not be surprising to anyone, let alone our policy makers. I would ask Mr. Haig that if it was his home which was violated, his brother who disappeared, or his children who have gone hungry—what would he do? These are the realities of which I speak. One of the first rules in understanding foreign policy is to be able to view the world from another country's point of view. Yet our leaders show a conspicuous degree of skill in failing to do just that.

I would offer this question to our policy makers: is it in the interest of the United States for the people of El Salvador to hate us for providing the guns that have killed and maimed their families, friends, and neighbors? I think that upon reflection even Mr. Haig would have to come to grips with that. However, this is where our current policy is taking us.

Recently in an open letter to President Reagan from five of El Salvador's guerrilla commanders an appeal was made to the United States to change its policy and accept a negotiated solution to the civil war. This letter was received coolly by the administration. This is again typical of the type of mistakes our policy makers have made again and again throughout the years.

My final point, and perhaps the most crucial mistake that our leaders make is to expect that democracy, as we know it, will develop in third world countries because we wish it to happen. In El Salvador the first step in the plan is scheduled to take place in March with free elections. I would offer to you and your colleagues in the House of Representatives why this thinking is impractical:

In order to have democracy there must be a consensus basic, social, economic, and political goals. El Salvador does not have this.

There must be an advanced form of nationalism to bring about national integration. This is presently developing in El Salvador, but its strength is with those who oppose the military dictatorship.

There must be secularization of politics. Clearly impossible in military dictatorship.

There must be reasonably high literacy rates—a democracy depends on the will of the majority. If the majority cannot read the masses can't be involved. El Salvador is largely illiterate.

There must be a sizable group with higher education and the right kind in order to get the economy developed. This is missing in El Salvador.

There must be enough people interested in participating in a democracy. Most Salvadorans don't know what democracy is, or Marxism for that matter.

There must be a trained and loyal civil service. Not there, in fact years away in El Salvador.

There must be a competitive political system. Missing.

There must be political as well as economic and social mobility. Nonexistent in El Salvador.

There must be a limited constitutional government. Not there.

There must be political as well as economic mobility. Not there. Economic development is necessary for political development.

People must gain experience on the local level first. Democracy must come from the grass roots up. Not there.

There must be developed a tradition of democracy, which in turn would develop a consensus. This has not yet begun in El Salvador.

There must be civilian control of the military. Conspicuously not there.

People must be allowed to progress in order for democracy to begin to develop. However, our current policy is to keep the status quo by trying to keep the military dictatorship in power by equipping it with arms, deterring development. Our policy in El Salvador is once again a contradiction of reality.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. LAVERTY,
Upper Darby, Pa. ●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE REMEMBERED

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, we must never forget countries which have held, if only for a short time, freedom in the palm of their hand. It is for this reason that I wish to recognize the Ukrainian National Republic's day of independence.

Three years after its birth on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic was brought under Soviet rule by the Bolsheviks. The area, which has a population of 50 million, is now known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and is, in name only, an independent republic within the Soviet Union. In reality, it is a part of the U.S.S.R.—subject to the same restrictions and abuses that plague the rest of the citizens of the Soviet Union.

It is particularly important now that we recognize this day to assure our brothers in Poland that their efforts, whether ultimately successful or unsuccessful, triumphant or trampled, will never be forgotten. Their struggle gives strength and courage to all present and future generations who seek freedom. What better way than to pay tribute to past generations who have done just that. ●

A DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR DR. KING

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights struggle that continues to this day should serve as a reminder to this body of the great symbolic importance that would be attached to the passage of H.R. 800, legislation

that would designate January 15 of every year as a national holiday commemorating the birth of the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

It is disturbing to note that the long and hard battles Dr. King fought—against discrimination in our schools, in our workplaces, in the voting booths across our land—are being challenged and gradually eroded by the Reagan administration. It is equally disturbing that the House of Representatives has yet taken no action on H.R. 800. I sincerely believe that if we are to keep alive the principles Dr. King lived and died for we must move immediately to adopt his bill.

Martin Luther King embodied, as has no other American, the quest for the equality of all women and men promised, in the Declaration of Independence more than two centuries ago. A national holiday honoring his dedication and his powerful contribution to the cause of civil rights will serve as a stirring remembrance of the man who brought the plight of the American black to the attention of our Nation, and who brought the plight of all oppressed minorities to the attention of the world.

Dr. King was still a young man when he was murdered in 1968, but he had already devoted more than 2 decades to his nonviolent crusade for color-blind justice and equality in America. The civil rights movement that culminated in the great legislative advances of the 1960's was ignited in 1955, in the nonviolent boycott led by Dr. King against the segregated bus system of Montgomery, Ala. It was a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that declared segregation in the buses of Montgomery unconstitutional—and that won Dr. King his place as a national leader for civil rights.

In the years that followed, Martin Luther King was ever in the forefront for the struggle. In the early 1960's, with millions of Americans only vaguely aware that their black countrymen were routinely being denied their constitutional right to vote, to go into public establishments, to attend public schools, or to purchase a home in the neighborhood of their choice, Dr. King and the freedom riders withstood ignorance in inhumility and deprivation to deliver their message to America.

It was on August 28, 1963, that Dr. King, leading 250,000 women, men, and children in the largest civil rights demonstration ever, proclaimed in our Nation's Capital: "I have a dream"—a dream that children of all races would someday walk hand in hand in a society free of discrimination, free of bitterness and hatred, and misunderstanding. The dream that Dr. King cherished is as powerful today as it was 2 decades ago. But it is imperiled by a strong tide to reaction against the

gains we have made in civil rights in our country.

This House must act if we are to forge that dream into a reality. H.R. 800 is a good and logical place to start.●

LIST OF VOTES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the House of Representatives here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of southern Arizona have the right to know where I stand on the issues decided by the House, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all-inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for specifics, or to visit my district office at 300 North Main, Tucson.

The list is arranged as follows:

KEY

1. Official rollcall number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of issue being voted on;
5. The date of the action;
6. My vote, in the form Y=yes, N=no, and NV=not voting.
7. The vote of the entire Arizona delegation, in the form (Yes—No—Not voting);
8. An indication whether the motion or amendment was passed or rejected; and
9. The total vote.

101. H.R. 3520. Steel Industry Compliance Extension. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to give steel companies, on a case-by-case basis, until Dec. 31, 1985 to meet the 1982 air pollution cleanup deadline. Money saved by deferring pollution control expenditures must be used to modernize older steel plants. June 26. Y(3-1-0). Adopted 412-4.

102. H.R. 3982. Budget Reconciliation. Amendments, considered en bloc, to strike parts of six titles of the bill recommended by the following committees: Agriculture; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Education and Labor; Post Office and Civil Service; Science and Technology; Ways and Means and to substitute provisions endorsed by President Reagan. June 26. N(3-1-0). Adopted 217-211.

103. H.R. 3982. Budget Reconciliation. Motion to order the previous question (thus ending further debate) on the Schneider, R-R.I., motion to recommit the bill to the Budget Committee with instructions to provide a twice-a-year cost-of-living adjustment

for federal employees. June 26. N(3-1-0). Agreed to 215-212.

104. H.R. 3982. Budget Reconciliation. Passage of the bill to revise existing laws to achieve budget savings in fiscal year 1982-84 as ordered by the first budget resolution for fiscal 1982. June 26. N(3-1-0). Passed 232-193.

105. H.R. 3982. Budget Reconciliation. Motion to table (kill) the Lott, R-Miss., motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. June 26. N(3-1-0). Agreed to 187-150.

106. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill to authorize funds for the Defense Department in fiscal 1982. July 8. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 345-2.

107. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill to authorize funds for the Defense Department in fiscal 1982. July 9. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 385-4.

108. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to the Hansen R-Utah, amendment to prohibit the expenditure of funds in the bill for the MX missile system until both houses of Congress have adopted resolutions approving the MX missile system selected by the President. July 9. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 201-207.

109. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Motion to end debate on the Dellums, D-Calif., amendment to delete \$2.4 billion for development of the MX missile system. July 9. N(3-1-0). Rejected 193-213.

110. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to delete \$2.4 billion for development of the MX missile system. July 9. N(0-4-0). Rejected 96-316.

111. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to make funds specified in the bill for the B-1 bomber available also for research and development of an advanced technology bomber. July 9. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 153-254.

112. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to reinstate a requirement that the Defense Department reduce the number of civilian employees in grades GS-13 to GS-18. July 9. Y(1-2-1). Rejected 142-249.

114. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill to authorize Defense Department funding for fiscal 1982. July 10. Y(3-0-1). Agreed to 370-2.

115. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Government Operations Committee amendment to delete a provision authorizing the Defense Department to use grants for research and procurement. July 10. Y(1-2-1). Rejected 190-194.

116. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriation, fiscal 1982. Motion to order the previous question (thus ending further debate) on the rule (H. Res. 171) providing for House floor consideration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. July 10. Y(3-0-1). Agreed to 336-13.

117. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations, fiscal 1982. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of a bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies. July 10. Y(3-0-1). Agreed to 326-7.

118. H.R. 3975. Production of Oil from Tar Sands. Motion to suspend the rules and pass

the bill to facilitate the production of oil from tar sands deposits on federal lands. July 14. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 416-0.

119. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Government Operations Committee amendment to delete from the bill increases in three thresholds on Defense Department purchases: an increase from \$10,000 to \$25,000 of the ceiling on the use of simplified small purchase procedures; an increase from \$100,000 to \$500,000 of the minimum amount of cost and pricing data that must be certified by contractors on the Truth in Negotiations Act; and an increase from \$100,000 to \$5 million of the maximum contract that can be negotiated by a service secretary for experimental, development or research work. July 14. N(0-4-0). Rejected 109-311.

120. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to the Judiciary Committee amendment to permit U.S. armed forces personnel to participate, under certain circumstances, in illegal drug seizures or arrests outside the land area of the United States. July 15. N(3-1-0). Adopted 248-168.

121. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Judiciary Committee amendment, as amended to authorize the armed services to cooperate with civilian law enforcement officials in operations against drug smuggling. July 15. Y(3-1-0). Adopted 362-49.

122. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Government Operations Committee amendment to place Defense Department procurement under a government wide procurement system and to authorize multi-year contracting only for purchases meeting certain conditions and specifically approved by Congress. July 15. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 133-283.

123. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to require that all purchases of computers and computer services for the Defense Department be made through the General Services Administration July 15. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 118-299.

124. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Substitute amendment to the Hillis, R-Ind., amendment to prohibit the armed services from buying automobiles manufactured outside the U.S. or Canada unless the Secretary of Defense certified to Congress that suitable automobiles manufactured in the U.S. or Canada were not available. July 15. N(0-3-1). Rejected 38-371.

125. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to delete provisions from the bill requiring Selective Service registrants to provide their Social Security numbers and providing for the Department of Defense and Treasury and Health and Human Services to share names and addresses of registrants. July 16. N(0-3-1). Rejected 125-290.

126. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to the Courter, R-N.J., substitute amendment to the Schroeder, D-Co., amendment to direct the President to propose by Jan. 15, 1982 at least \$8 billion in rescissions in Defense Department budget authority that was unnecessary or attributable to waste, fraud, abuse or mismanagement. July 16. Y(1-2-1). Rejected 142-276.

127. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Substitute amendment to the Schroeder, D-Co., amendment to direct the President to submit to Congress by Jan. 15, 1982 his recommendations for improving the efficiency and management in the De-

fense Department and for eliminating waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement in the Department. The President also would be directed to report on actions taken concerning General Accounting Office reports on waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement in the Defense Department. July 16. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 416-0.

128. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to prohibit use of funds in the bill for research, development, testing, evaluation or procurement of the F/A-18 fighter/attack aircraft. The amendment directed that the \$3.1 billion specified in the bill for the F/A-18 be made available instead for other Navy and Marine Corps aircraft programs. July 16. N(0-3-1) Rejected 101-316.

129. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to bar procurement of A-7K attack planes and use funds earmarked for that plane to buy instead 13 F-16 fighters. July 16. N(0-3-1). Rejected 148-268.

130. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Amendment to bar the Secretary of any armed service from signing a contract worth more than \$50,000 to purchase civilian cars or light trucks not made in the U.S. or Canada, without legislative authorization. July 16. N(0-3-1). Adopted 231-187.

131. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Passage of the bill to authorize \$136,111,000 for Defense Department weapons procurement, military research operations and maintenance and civil defense in fiscal 1982. July 16. Y(3-0-1). Passed 354-63.

132. H.R. 3519. Defense Department Authorization. Motion to allow the House-Senate conference committee on the fiscal 1982 defense authorization bill (S. 815) to be closed to the public when classified information was under consideration. July 16. Y(3-0-1) Agreed to 381-2.

133. H. Res. 177. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Policy. Adoption of the resolution calling on the President to develop and implement a nuclear non-proliferation policy that would strengthen the barriers to the spread of nuclear weapons and prescribe concrete methods for restraint by all nuclear supplier nations; encourage nations to ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty; work to develop sanctions against nations that divert nuclear supplies from peaceful purposes into nuclear weapons; and fully implement the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978. July 17. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 365-0.

134. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to reduce the appropriation for the Office of Policy Development and Research in the Department of Housing and Urban Development from \$30 million to \$20 million. July 17. N(2-1-1). Adopted 202-162.

135. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendments (considered en bloc) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from spending funds to require states to implement or enforce programs for vehicle emission control inspection and maintenance. July 17. N(2-1-1). Rejected 177-184.

136. H. Res. 181. Social Security. Motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution stating that the House "strongly urges that the necessary steps be taken to insure that Social Security benefits are not reduced for those currently receiving them." July 21. Y(3-1-0). Agreed to 405-13.

137. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendments to cut the appropriation for the Na-

tional Science Foundation from \$1.06 billion to \$995 million. July 21. N(3-1-0). Rejected 152-264.

138. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$62,599,958,500 in fiscal 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 20 independent agencies. July 21. Y(3-1-0). Passed 362-54.

139. H.R. 4035. Interior Appropriations fiscal 1982. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill. July 21. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 378-3.

140. H.R. 4035. Interior Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to provide \$100 million for the administrative expenses of the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program. July 21. Y(3-0-1). Rejected 96-320.

141. H.R. 4035. Interior Appropriations fiscal 1982. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. July 22. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 383-3.

142. H.R. 4035. Interior Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$135 million earmarked for the solvent refined coal demonstration plant at Newman, Ky. July 22. Y(2-2-0). Rejected 177-236.

143. H.R. 4035. Interior Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$30,000 earmarked for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission. July 22. N(2-2-0). Rejected 201-216.

144. H.R. 4035. Interior Appropriations fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$11,139,727,000 in fiscal 1982 for the Interior Department and related agencies. July 22. Y(3-1-0). Passed 358-46.

145. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 185) providing for House floor consideration of the fiscal 1982 appropriations bill for energy and water development programs. July 23. Y(3-1-0). Adopted 233-178.

146. H.R. 4119. Agriculture Appropriations fiscal 1982. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 178) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to provide fiscal 1982 funds for the Agriculture Department and related agencies. July 23. NV(3-0-1). Adopted 274-131.

147. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to the Myers, R-Ind., amendment to delete \$189 million for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. July 23. N(0-4-0). Rejected 198-208.

148. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to the Myers, R-Ind., amendment to delete \$17.8 million for the Stonewall Jackson, W.Va. dam and prohibit further federal spending on the project. July 23. N(0-4-0). Rejected 137-267.

149. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$4 million for the Garrison Diversion water project in North Dakota. July 23. N(0-4-0). Rejected 188-206.

150. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$228 million for the Clinch River (Tenn.) nuclear breeder reactor. July 24. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 186-206.

151. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to transfer \$10 million for research at the privately operated Barnwell, S.C. nuclear fuel reprocessing facility to government nuclear waste research. July 24. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 157-213.

152. H.R. 4144. Energy and Water Development Appropriations fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$13,189,674,000 in fiscal 1982 for energy and water development programs. July 24. Y(4-0-0). Passed 244-104.

153. H.R. 2819. District of Columbia Federal Payment. Passage of the bill to increase from \$300 million to \$336.6 million the authorization for fiscal 1982 and each fiscal year thereafter for the annual federal payment to the District of Columbia. July 27. Y(1-2-1). Passed 209-179.

154. H.R. 2818. District of Columbia Borrowing Authority. Passage of the bill to extend for two years the authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia to accept certain interim loans from the U.S. government and to extend the authority of the Treasury Secretary to make such loans. July 27. Y(1-2-1). Passed 239-149.

155. H.R. 4119. Agriculture Appropriations fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$22,730,534,000 for fiscal 1982 for the Agriculture Department and related agencies. July 27. Y(1-2-1). Passed 343-33.●

JOHN GRAHAM McCROREY: A MAN OF VISION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I had the pleasure of being in York, Pa., at the headquarters of McCrory Stores. The occasion was the dedication of the Lorence A. Silverberg Memorial Museum and the kick-off of the yearlong observance of the 100th anniversary of the founding of McCrory Stores. I was able to learn firsthand some of the history of variety stores starting back in the five-and-dime days. I would like to recount for you now some of this history as it is preserved in the McCrory Museum.

McCrory's history goes back to 1882 when John G. McCrory, a 22-year-old dry goods clerk, opened his first 5-and-10-cent store in Scottdale, Pa., with \$350 in savings and \$200 in borrowed money. The store recorded sales of \$25,000 that first year. If living today, he would be proud to know that his initial investment was the beginning of an organization having annual sales of approximately \$750 million a hundred years later.

By 1901 John G. McCrory had 20 stores producing an annual sales volume of \$498,000. Always a frugal man, he had dropped the "e" from his name, allegedly to reduce the cost of the gilt-lettered signs over his stores. Having outgrown its Johnstown, Pa., headquarters, the company established its main office in New York City in 1901. It was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware in 1915.

Food service was first introduced in a McCrory store during World War I. John McCrory could foresee that having a lunch counter in a store

would not only be a convenience for his regular customers but also might bring in more customers. He set aside areas for this purpose in several of the stores and started operating them as concessions, serving light food and refreshments. After a few years the company took over the operation of the food counters. The food counters grew to luncheonettes and, much later, the luncheonettes to restaurants and cafeterias. Today, food service is an integral and profitable part of the firm's operations and is available in 475 of its stores as well as in a number of free-standing restaurants.

John G. McCrory retired from active participation in the company in 1933 in order to devote his energies to philanthropic interests, which he did until his death in 1943 at age 83.

The decade following World War II was critical for the variety store industry. Population shifts away from urban centers to suburbia changed the face of retailing. Those failing to recognize this trend found themselves in serious financial difficulty.

McCrorys survived these changes and, in 1963, opened a 750,000-square-foot distribution center in York, Pa. In 1966 its headquarters offices were moved from New York City to York, although small buying offices for fashion apparel are maintained in New York and Los Angeles.

Other small variety chains had sprung up over the years and their numbers of stores continued to grow by way of either opening new units or gaining control of smaller independents. Notable among those companies that were eventually merged into the McCrory family of stores, after having realized their own measures of success, were McLellan Stores in 1959; H. L. Green Co., Inc., in 1961; and J. J. Newberry Co., in 1972. McCrorys also took over 15 former W. T. Grant stores in 1976, 8 former Neisner stores in 1980, and in 1981 acquired S. H. Kress and V. J. Elmore stores from Genesco.

In 1975 management established a goal of substantially increasing the sales per square foot and decreasing expenses in order to capture the greatest profit from increased sales. By closing unprofitable stores, rehabilitating certain stores, reducing operating costs, and instituting an aggressive sales program, McCrorys was able to steadily increase sales and profits. The decision was made to stay solely in the variety store business.

McCrory stores has come a long way from its founding, and today is headed by Ben Litwak, chairman, and J. Philip Lux, president. Both Litwak and Lux came up through the ranks to attain their present positions, Litwak having started as a manager trainee in 1936 and Lux as a part-time stockboy in the McCrory store managed by his father in the midforties. Lux recalls that—

We sold silk stockings back then instead of nylon and the best pair in stock sold for only 59-cents. Variety stores were the discounters and convenience stores of the 1940's because drug and grocery stores did not carry the variety of items they do now.

Inflation and high interest rates have had a limiting effect on merchandise assortments, energy costs, and borrowing. Yet, according to Lux, the variety store market tends to broaden during difficult times. He notes:

Persons in high income groups are finding their discretionary incomes reduced, and we are seeing people buying socks and many other items at our stores who previously would not have considered shopping for them in a variety store.

While in 1982 McCrorys will take a quick look back at all that has taken place in the last 100 years—the peaks and valleys; prosperous and depression times; the closing of some stores and the opening of new ones; with mergers and new faces in top management; an increasing variety of goods; the arrival of the jet age; instant communications and the need for better responsiveness; improved means of inventory control and distribution—it is too busy planning ahead to look for long. Its management has initiated as strategic planning process to enable its executives to quickly perceive trends, assess their importance, and position the company to meet the changing environment.

Employing John G. McCrory's philosophy of looking ahead, the slogan adopted for the 100th anniversary year of McCrory stores is "We've only just begun."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that our country produced a John Graham McCrory who was such a believer in the free enterprise system. Historically the variety store industry has been a forerunner in providing employment opportunities for our youth and has instilled in them the work ethic that has been so important to the success of our great country.

The successful chains of variety stores that have survived their first century are few, and it is significant that this successful firm has adhered to the fundamental standards of its founder.●

ERA: EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 12, is Abraham Lincoln's birthday. One of Lincoln's greatest acts as President was his signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. It was a great step toward furthering the idea of equality in the United States.

It led to the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which prohibited the country from denying any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws.

State legislatures in 15 States have a chance to follow in the footsteps of Abraham Lincoln and to enrich the Constitution by ratifying the equal rights amendment: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

The following Christian Science Monitor article by Dr. William Van Alstyne, a professor of constitutional law at Duke University, explains why the Constitution would be poorer without the ERA:

THE CONSTITUTION WOULD BE POORER WITHOUT ERA

This June will mark either the passing of an era or the passage of an ERA. Without approval of three additional state legislatures, 50 years of efforts that moved two-thirds of both houses in Congress, and a decade of effort that won approval by 35 states, will end in failure. The world's oldest written extant Constitution, our own, would still provide no fundamental commitment that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Prudent people already think they know the outcome—that among 15 states there will be no favorable majorities in the general assemblies of even three states. Already the 27th Amendment is treated as a game, the outcome of which we know. "They" (the women) have lost.

From within the Constitution where I live professionally, the view is quite different. It is a view of pending loss, of historic and constitutional opportunity about to be forfeited. It is also a professional sense of sheer amazement. I would have thought that the chance to count oneself significantly, in adding a memorable and permanent improvement to the Constitution of the United States, would not lightly be rejected by men and women whose other votes in state assemblies cannot possibly be comparable in significance. It is incredible to me that state assembly members, living from year to year through forgettable bills of appropriation, endless caucuses, and recurring campaigns do not see how one vote, on this issue, provides a greater claim to history than anything else they may do.

The indifference of state assembly members to make ratification their most important business cannot be on grounds that the 27th Amendment is trivial, because it is not. It carries into words eminently suitable for a Constitution a proposition neither condescending nor at all objectionable. Rather, like the 13th Amendment (which forever interred chattel slavery) it speaks against the recurring and incorrigible tendencies of government to be condescending, ignorantly denying equality of rights by gender.

The objection that the wording of the Equal Rights Amendment would be an iron bed of Procrustes, relentlessly indifferent to any gender-related distinctions at all (the example is often given of mandatory unisex dressing rooms or bathrooms in all governmentally-operated facilities) is quite mistaken. Where considerations of hygiene, safety, and privacy are involved "equality of rights under the law" (which is exactly and only

what the amendment provides) is plainly not offended by separate facilities equal in usefulness and the separateness of which stigmatizes no one.

On the other hand, I have heard it said that the 27th Amendment is not needed because the Constitution already adequately speaks to this subject. But this, too, is seriously in error. The equal protection clause (of the 14th Amendment) has embarrassed the Supreme Court by its very poor adaptability to gender-based discrimination by government.

Partly this is so because such forms of unequal treatment by government played virtually no role whatever in its Reconstruction passage, in 1868. Partly it is because the sole reference to sex in the 14th Amendment itself explicitly allowed women altogether to be denied any right to vote (an "accommodation" provided by the 14th Amendment that it required the separate 19th Amendment, ratified in 1920, to overcome). And partly it is because the court fully understands that gender-based laws cannot be analyzed in perfect analogy to race-based laws (which are the focus of the 14th Amendment), and that the comparison is often very faulty.

This difference is recognized in the different language of the Equal Rights Amendment itself. Thus, it provides for "equality of rights under the law," and admits to common sense distinctions relevant to gender that would not be relevant to race.

The fact is that the Constitution is a poorer document without this amendment, just as it was once even weaker in having no 14th Amendment and, in the beginning, no Bill of Rights at all.

The amendment should be read again, read privately, thought about quietly. It should be compared with the balance of our Constitution, its conformity in style and spirit examined fairly and with detachment. If that is done, then by June it is still possible for us to mark the passage of the 27th Amendment, and not simply the passing of an era.●

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY— MARCH 18, 1982

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● **Mr. DE LA GARZA.** Mr. Speaker, today, for myself and on behalf of Mr. WAMPLER of Virginia, ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and 127 other Members of the House, I have introduced a resolution to proclaim March 18, 1982, as "National Agriculture Day."

The resolution would authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The purpose behind this resolution, which is identical to a resolution which became law for 1981, is simple but significant.

American agriculture, including farmers, workers, and all the other participants in the food and fiber chain, is the Nation's largest and most

productive industry. A healthy farm economy, working with efficient agribusiness industries, is the foundation of a healthy national economy. Every American wants this country to pull out of the current recession, recovery in other industries will be hampered unless the farm sector also is healthy.

Because of this basic fact, I believe that every American should have a full understanding of what agriculture means to his or her life. Only a relative handful of our people live on farms, but the rest of us are deeply affected by what happens in agriculture, and our citizens will make better and sounder national policy decisions if they have all the facts about this cornerstone industry.

This is the purpose of our resolution—to help spread understanding. One of the most effective methods of promoting that understanding in recent years has been the annual observance of Agriculture Day, which is coordinated by the Agriculture Council of America, a nonprofit, bipartisan organization devoted to communicating the facts about modern agriculture.

Our resolution would cost taxpayers nothing. But it would add the emphasis of formal Government recognition to the efforts which are already underway to make 1982 National Agriculture Day an effective observance.

Agriculture Day is celebrated in local communities all around the Nation—in schools, in exhibits, in tours, and in ceremonies of many kinds. There will be proclamations and recognition of the day by many mayors, Governors, and other officials. Millions of Americans will be given a refresher course in how American agriculture works, and how the superior productivity of our agriculture compares with the food systems in other countries.

The 1982 observance which our resolution supports will bring together farmers and ranchers, farm and commodity groups, and many other organizations for a united effort to speak to the American people. We hope many more of our House colleagues will join us quickly in sponsoring the resolution.●

H.R. 5424—MONO LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT BILL

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● **Mr. SANTINI.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words today in support of a bill introduced by Congressman SHUMWAY to make Mono Lake a national monument. I was pleased and proud to join in an effort to protect and preserve this California lake. H.R.

5424 is an attempt to provide national park management and protection to one of America's most unique aquatic treasures. Mono Lake lies between the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the Great Basin at an elevation of 6,372 feet. It is over 1 million years old and is a scientific and geologic showcase with its volcanic formations, unique bird habitat and pristine environment.

Unfortunately, because of water diversions, Mono Lake is in very real danger of drying up and losing its ecological life support system. As a staunch believer in State water rights, I continue to believe that the basic and fundamental water issues must be ironed out by the State of California. Nevertheless, we cannot stand idly by and see an American resource dwindle and die. Giving Mono Lake national monument status will require that it be managed like a national park with emphasis on preservation of geologic and scenic values and recreational opportunities. In addition, we will require that a comprehensive study be conducted on alternative water management practices and that an inventory be taken of all terrestrial and aquatic species and factors contributing to their decline.

Why is a Nevada Congressman interested in the fate of Mono Lake? The answer is pretty simple. Mono Lake lies just over the Nevada-California boundary and provides recreation and scenic enjoyment for many, many Nevadans as well as Californians. Mono Lake is a memorable site for countless Nevadans, driving south on Highway 395 to Yosemite from Reno. In fact during the ice ages when Mono Lake was many times its present size, it actually reached eastward into Nevada. The region is tied together historically and environmentally and I am committed to lend my support to the efforts of our neighbors to the west to keep Mono Lake from going the way of so many of our western water bodies.

We all have a lot at stake in the Mono basin—the wildlife, the environment, recreational pursuits, and shrimp harvesting, just to name a few resources. I urge my House colleagues to lend a helping hand to save Mono Lake from becoming another dry desert lake of the past. Thank you.●

REPORT OF EL SALVADOR TRIP

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● **Mr. EDGAR.** Mr. Speaker, Bishop Joseph H. Yeakel, of the United Methodist Church reminded me recently of a strong statement put out by the governing board of the National Council

of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, November 5, 1981, on the issue of U.S. Government involvement in El Salvador. In light of the recent debate on future involvement, I urge my colleagues to read the following report and note the important recommendations as stated:

REPORT OF EL SALVADOR TRIP

A delegation sponsored by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. visited El Salvador, from October 24 to 28, 1981. The members of the delegation were:

The Rev. Dr. James Andrews, Stated Clerk, Presbyterian Church in the United States;

Kara Cole, Administrative Secretary, Friends United Meeting;

The Rt. Rev. David Reed, Episcopal Church, Bishop of Kentucky;

Rev. Hugh Smith, Secretary, Public Relations, American Baptist International Ministries;

Dr. William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; and

Bishop Joseph Yeakel, United Methodist Church, Bishop of New York West Area.

Staff: The Rt. Rev. J. Antonio Ramos, Associate Director of Caribbean and Latin America Office, DOM, NCCCUSA; Mr. Mark Schomer, Church World Service Central America Representative; and the Rev. Dr. Eugene L. Stockwell, Associate General Secretary for Overseas Ministries, NCCCUSA.

The visit was a pastoral visit to the churches of El Salvador, intended to convey our identification with them in the current tragic suffering they and their nation are facing. The visit was intended also to assist us toward a deeper insight into the current reality of El Salvador in order that we as U.S. churches and people might respond more adequately to their needs.

In addition to many individual conversations, the delegation schedule included:

Sunday worship in the Roman Catholic Cathedral, First Baptist Church, Emmanuel Baptist Church, Episcopal Church and Lutheran Church of the Resurrection;

Visit with leadership of CREDHO, Episcopal Social Action agency;

Visit to San Jose de la Montana, Refuge for Displaced persons;

Dinner with Student Christian Movement leaders;

Meeting with leadership of Emmanuel Baptist Church;

Meeting with Socorro Juridico, A Roman Catholic Legal Aid organization;

Conversation with Dr. Ricardo Stein, Professor at Central American University;

Meeting with ASESAN, an ecumenical humanitarian relief agency;

Meeting with the Human Rights Commission;

Meeting with the Committee of Mothers and Relatives of Disappeared persons;

Meeting with Lutheran Church of the Resurrection leadership;

Dinner with Ambassador Deane Hinton, U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador along with four senior Embassy staff members;

Meeting with Baptist Association leadership;

Conversation with Society of Jesus Leadership;

Meeting with Roman Catholic Apostolic Administrator Msgr. Arturo Rivera y Damas, together with Msgr. Ricardo

Urioste, Vicar General of the Archdiocese, and Father Fabian Amaya;

Meeting with pastors of several Pentecostal and evangelical denominations related to CESAD, a humanitarian relief agency, including the representative in El Salvador of the United Bible Societies.

Of necessity the delegation's visit was brief. We do not claim to have achieved a complete understanding of the complex facets of the El Salvador situation, or of the Christian community in that land. Inevitably every view of El Salvador is partial. We are conscious of the fact that we talked to only a limited number of persons, and we were not able to travel outside the capital city. We feel impelled to report some things we heard and make some recommendations to the NCCCUSA Governing Board.

Certain themes were repeatedly expressed to us:

A. REGARDING THE CURRENT SITUATION IN EL SALVADOR

1. El Salvador is a nation in which death is a pervasive and immediate reality. Assassinations, bombings, executions, disappearances, hunger, the destruction of communities, the dismemberment of economic and social life at their very roots—all these and more are part of daily life. The people live in agony. Unspeakable suffering is everywhere.

2. The situation in El Salvador is deteriorating. Since October 15, 1979, when a military Junta overthrew the presidency of General Carlos Humberto Romero, the increased dominance of the military and increased guerrilla activity have been accompanied by widespread terror throughout the country. We heard repeatedly of governmental decrees issued during the last two years which, as one observer stated, progressively reduced the "political space" in the nation to a point where rational political processes are impossible and legal redress for criminal and civil wrongs is virtually unavailable.

3. The violation of human rights is commonplace and constant. The legal system is practically inoperative. Investigation of murder, torture and major violations of persons and property, is not forthcoming. The grossest excesses go uninvestigated and unpunished. The fate of most persons is left to the whim of the military, paramilitary and security forces. We heard widespread agreement that by far most of the violence directed against persons, as contrasted with sabotage and property damage, is perpetrated by government forces, or by forces in whose activities the government acquiesces.

4. The role of the United States in El Salvador is discussed everywhere. We heard repeated calls for the U.S. to withdraw its military and economic aid, which many believe prolongs repression and suffering. One observer said, "By prolonging the conflict the U.S. is causing the development of the very kind of government in El Salvador that it fears the most." We heard calls for the cessation of all outside support of the warring parties, whether from the U.S. or from socialist nations. Nevertheless, the massive support of U.S. support is singled out over and over again for particular objection, though the U.S. Ambassador urges even greater U.S. assistance. The people of El Salvador want to be free to solve their own problems without outside pressures.

5. We heard great concern for people displaced within El Salvador by military operations of all parties, as for refugees outside the country. Once outside the country it is felt refugees have at least a chance of aid

from international governmental and private agencies; however, within El Salvador the plight of displaced peoples, of whatever political complexion, is inadequately perceived and addressed by public or private agencies. Resources are needed inside El Salvador to assist these suffering persons and communities, and such resources will have to come from outside El Salvador.

B. REGARDING THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN EL SALVADOR

1. The Christian churches in El Salvador playing a constructive role in the present situation—in analysis of the current reality and its root causes, in the provision of spiritual and legal assistance, in furnishing humanitarian aid to the suffering and in the search for a just and peaceful political and social order.

2. The Roman Catholic Church is under increasing attacks, misrepresenting its work and threatening physical harm and even death to clergy and lay leadership alike. The campaign has been stepped up during the past month.

3. All Christian churches in El Salvador, despite immense difficulties which include the assassination, disappearance, and imprisonment of leaders and members of many congregations, are witnessing magnificently to the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Adversity has driven them to the roots of the Gospel. The churches' ministry—prophetic and pastoral, challenging and compassionate, reflective and reconciling—takes on a compelling immediacy. We were impressed by the youth of many of the church leaders, and by the prominence of lay persons in the churches' witness. The unbiblical dichotomy between evangelization and social witness is resolved as the needs of the nation elicit a powerful ministry for justice and reconciliation. We thank God for the Christian community of El Salvador, and we believe it calls us to a more relevant witness in the United States, a witness of Biblical and theological depth in which we too often fail to engage. In El Salvador it is evident that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is indeed redemptive and liberating.

4. The Christian churches of El Salvador do not just talk about cooperation; they live it. Evangelical groups are working with CARITAS, a Roman Catholic agency. Baptists cooperate closely with Roman Catholics in ASESAN, the relief agency which the World Council of Churches and Church World Service support. The Student Christian Movement membership cuts across denominations.

5. Amazingly, many churches seem to be revitalized by current suffering and persecution. In some churches membership is growing. The congregations we visited were well attended. In the Roman Catholic church persons seeking Christian Vocations are growing in number.

6. The martyrdom and memory of the late Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero is a powerful force of inspiration and example for the Christians of El Salvador, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike, referred to constantly. We give thanks for his remarkable ministry to the church and the nation, focused primarily on the poor and the oppressed.

C. REGARDING THE FUTURE OF EL SALVADOR

1. There is widespread belief that the El Salvador situation will continue to worsen in the immediate future. The governing Junta, with U.S. support, aims for a military solution, which still is thought by them to

be obtainable despite the current military situation.

2. The election of delegates to a Constitutional Assembly, proposed for March, 1982 by the present Junta, is widely rejected as a formula for improvement of the political situation. Conditions for a representative election are not currently present. Even the U.S. Ambassador, in a press interview on October 27, stated that at present the conditions for such elections do not exist, though he hoped that possibly they might exist five months from now. We heard little or no hope for a political resolution along these lines; on the contrary, there was much rejection of this proposed political process.

3. We heard a strong call for dialogue or negotiation between the contending forces in El Salvador. Currently the Junta, with U.S. support, rejects dialogue or negotiation with representatives of the forces opposed to the government. The attitude of the U.S. government is key to the development of a dialogue or negotiation process. We are aware of some recent initiatives in the U.S. Senate which might encourage the negotiation or dialogue, and these hold out some promise of movement in a positive direction. Repeatedly we heard of the sheer tiredness of the people of El Salvador, their sense of helplessness, their revulsion at the continuing death and suffering, and their hope that military confrontation and repression will end. Face to face dialogue and negotiation to which representatives opposed to the government say they are open, is thought by many to offer some hope in what now is seemingly intractable military confrontation.

In the light of our experience in El Salvador, we make the following recommendations to the NCCCUSA Governing Board at its meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, on November 4-5, 1981:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CHURCHES

1. We urge the Governing Board, its member denominations, and related ecumenical bodies and their congregations and members, to pray for the suffering people of El Salvador, and for a prompt, peaceful and just resolution of the conflict in El Salvador.

2. We urge the Governing Board, its member denominations and related ecumenical bodies, to continue and increase the provisions of humanitarian assistance to the people of El Salvador and to refugees from that nation. In particular we urge greater support be channeled to meet the needs of persons displaced by military operations of the contending parties who are victims of the war and repression, inside El Salvador itself. We believe Church World Service offers an excellent channel for such ecumenical support.

3. We urge the Governing Board, its member denominations and related ecumenical bodies, to provide increased information to church members and the public at large regarding the present situation in El Salvador—its history, the issues at stake, the suffering of the people, the role of the churches, and the possibilities for a just resolution of the conflict in the near future. The plight of undocumented refugees from El Salvador who have come to the United States should receive special understanding and attention. We urge that insofar as possible the views of Christian church constituencies in El Salvador be communicated widely.

4. We urge the Governing Board, its member denominations and related ecumenical bodies, to support the efforts of interna-

tional organizations, both ecclesiastical and secular (such as the World Council of Churches and Amnesty International, and the NCCCUSA Human Rights office) which endeavor to publicize the status of human rights violations in El Salvador on the basis of reliable evidence, thus to keep the light of international concern focused on El Salvador.

5. We urge the Governing Board, its member denominations and related ecumenical bodies to press upon the government of the United States the recommendations listed below.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

1. We urge the government of the United States to seek a negotiated solution, rather than a military solution, to the conflict between the contending parties in El Salvador which might in time provide the just conditions necessary for fair and representative elections in that country.

2. We urge the government of the United States to afford political asylum or some special temporary status for refugees who flee El Salvador to the United States.

3. We urge the government of the United States to provide increased assistance to international organizations that help to meet the needs of Salvadoran refugees in other countries of this hemisphere.

4. We urge the government of the United States to take diplomatic initiatives to effect the termination of military assistance to all groups in El Salvador. In particular, we urge our government to terminate its present policy of providing military and economic assistance to the governing Junta of El Salvador.

(The Governing Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, November 5, 1981, approved as its own the above recommendations to the churches and to the United States government on pages 5 and 6.)

ACT OF HEROISM IN PORT WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● **Mr. LeBOUTILLIER.** Mr. Speaker, the President pointed out in the state of the Union message that there are real heroes in this country, one only needs to look for them. I believe that there is a young man in my district that truly deserves to be called a hero.

In the early morning hours of January 17, 1982, Police Officer Stephen Cardello of the Port Washington Police Department was on patrol on Roslyn W. Shore Road in Port Washington. He observed an auto accident at the stated location and called for assistance as one of the autos had burst into flames.

As the Daily News reported, Police Officer Cardello quickly went to the aid of the passengers in the burning auto. Both doors were jammed as a result of the accident. Officer Cardello broke the passenger door window with a fire extinguisher, wrenched the door

open, and pulled out one of the passengers. He then returned to the burning auto where he managed to free the operator of the auto who was dazed and bleeding.

At this time passing motorists stopped to assist. Officer Cardello instructed them to move the accident victims away from the burning auto which he feared would explode at any moment.

For a third time Officer Cardello returned to the burning auto, and although he was suffering from smoke inhalation himself managed to free a third victim. A fourth victim who was pinned in the auto, which was a two-door sedan, died despite Officer Cardello's attempts of rescue.

The Port Washington Mail & Reporter observed that Port Washington Police Chief Edmund Swiecki verbally applauded Officer Cardello's heroism, stating "That the officer had to break open the windows, because the doors were sealed, to drag the injured people out." The chief added "That Cardello did a fabulous job without thinking of his own safety but aware of the possibility of an explosion ordered the young people helping him to stand away while he brought the injured out to safety."

This courageous act by Officer Cardello deserves the highest praise. He unwittingly risked his life to save others and therefore has earned the title of hero. I am proud that such an individual resides in my district. His action should serve as an inspiration and model for others:

[From the Port Washington (N.Y.) Mail & Reporter, Jan. 21, 1982]

HERO POLICEMAN PULLS THREE FROM BLAZING CAR CRASH

(By Jackie Farrell)

A 31-year-old Bayside man, trapped in his father's car after it had been hit from behind, was killed when the car exploded at about 12:45 a.m., Sunday, January 17 on Roslyn West Shore Road.

Port Washington Police Officer Stephen Cardello, who was driving south on the road, stopped at the scene and tried to free the other passengers in both cars. Assisted by four teenagers who stopped their cars after witnessing the accident, Officer Cardello is credited with saving the lives of at least three of the six injured in the rear-end collision.

According to the police, Jeffrey Zagelbaum, 31, was pinned inside the car that had been driven by his father, Benjamin Zagelbaum, 68, and was northbound on West Shore Road when it was hit from behind by a car operated by Arthur Garry, 18, of 24 Prospect Avenue, Port Washington. Cause of the crash is being investigated, police said.

Pulled from the debris prior to the Zagelbaum car explosion, were Mildred Zagelbaum, 60, and Deanna Stilow, 35, of Richmond Hill, who was said to be the young Zagelbaum's girlfriend. The elder Zagelbaum and Miss Stilow were admitted to St. Francis Hospital with head lacerations and multiple injuries. Both were listed in stable con-

dition. Zagelbaum's wife also was treated at St. Francis Hospital for cuts and bruises and released, police said.

Two passenger's in Garry's car, Christopher Allan, 17, of 16 Monfort Road and Edwin Mora, 17, of 704 Port Washington Boulevard, who were pulled out from Garry's car, were treated for cuts and bruises at St. Francis Hospital and released.

The Port Washington teenagers who assisted Officer Cardello are Joseph Timpone, Robert Nash, Joseph Frappaolo and Stephen Zaccherio.

Officer Cardello joined "Port's Finest" in September, 1981. An Air Force veteran, he lives in Ronkonkoma, with his wife, Nancy, and their two children, Stephen, five, and Nicole, three years old. The young couple, married ten years, were childhood sweethearts and graduated from West Islip High School. Officer Cardello is also an alumnus of Suffolk Community College.

Port Washington Police Chief Edmund Swiecki verbally applauded Officer Cardello's heroism, stating that the officer had to break open the windows because the doors were sealed, in order to drag out the injured people. The chief added that Cardello did a fabulous job without thinking of his own safety but aware of the possibility of an explosion ordered the young people helping him to stand away while he brought out the injured to safety.

[From the Port Washington (N.Y.) News, Jan. 21, 1982]

PORT COP, PORT YOUTHS SAVE 3 FROM FLAMING CAR

"Right from the beginning this kid impressed everybody around here. It's no surprise to me that he would do something like this," said Port Washington Police Chief Edmond Swiecki of a new police officer who risked his life this week to save three people from a burning car.

Police Officer Steven Cardello, 29, who was sworn into the Port Washington Police Department in April, will probably be cited for heroism by his department.

Cardello was on a routine patrol on Sunday at 12:45 a.m. when he saw an accident on Roslyn West Shore Road. He requested an ambulance, fire trucks, rescue tools, and assistance.

A car driven by Benjamin Zagelbaum, 68, of Flushing was going north on Roslyn West Shore Road that dark, cold icy night when his car was hit in the rear by a car driven by Joseph Garry, 18, of 24 Prospect Ave. Zagelbaum's car caught fire and Cardello immediately tried to get out the four people in it.

Both doors were jammed, so he broke the window of the passenger door with a fire extinguisher, opened this door, and pulled out Mildred Zagelbaum, 60, also of Flushing. By this time, Cardello was joined by Joseph Frappaolo of 22 Vanderventer Ave. and Stephen Zaccherio, another Port youth, who took Mrs. Zagelbaum from Officer Cardello and moved her away from the burning car.

Police said flames were coming out of the back of the car and the dashboard. Cardello told the two teenagers to get away from the car because he was afraid it would explode. But that did not deter Cardello from pulling Zagelbaum, who was dazed and bleeding from the head, out from behind the steering wheel.

Meanwhile, two other Port teenagers, Joseph Timpone and Robert Nash, came along and helped the three people in the other car. Then Nash helped Cardello get Deana Stilow, 35, of Richmond Hills, from the back seat. The Zagelbaums' son, Jeffrey,

31, was pinned in the back seat crying for help. Before Cardello could free him, he became silent, apparently dead.

Later, his body was removed by Port Washington Fire Department volunteers, who had to use hydraulic tools to do so.

Zagelbaum was taken to St. Francis Hospital in serious condition with multiple injuries. His wife was also taken there, treated for leg injuries, and released. Stilow was taken to St. Francis, where she is listed in fair condition with two broken legs and multiple pelvic fractures.

Also taken to St. Francis were the three persons in the second car, who were treated for bruises and released. In addition to the driver, the car was occupied by Christopher Allen of 16 Monfort Rd. and Edwin Mora of 704 Port Washington Boulevard.

Police Officer Cardello was treated at North Shore University Hospital for smoke inhalation and was then released. He lives in Ronkonkoma.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF WINFRED JACKSON

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Midfield in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, suffered a great loss with the death of its mayor, Winfred Jackson. It is my privilege today to offer a tribute to the memory of this wonderful man.

Not many people achieve the measure of admiration and respect that Mayor Winfred Jackson enjoyed. He earned that admiration and respect because he genuinely cared about people and about the welfare of his community.

He was a rarity—a man who had the vitality and know-how to be extremely effective in getting things done, yet warmth and sensitivity that made him a beloved leader.

Winfred Jackson was serving his second term as mayor of the suburb just west of Birmingham. He was first elected mayor in 1976 after serving on the city council. He was reelected in 1980 and had served 1 year of his second term before his death.

Mayor Jackson will be remembered for his outstanding achievements and accomplishments during his years of public service. Since he became mayor, the city has divided the police and fire departments, previously overseen by one man, and hired its first paid fire chief. A fire station was added in the Highlands area of the city and sewer work was begun in areas that did not have this service. In recent months, he had focused on keeping the city's finances in working fiscal shape.

Jackson, a band booster, was "the kind of man who was up before dawn to see the Midfield High School Band off on a trip or who was going with them even when his children weren't

in the band," said Superintendent of Education Robert Bumpus.

He was recently promoted to transportation supervisor at United States Steel. He had worked there since serving in the Air Force during the Korean conflict.

Surviving are his wife, Martha; two daughters, Wendy and Judy; and two sons, Kelly and Robbey.

Mayor Winfred Jackson's life should serve as a memorial to him for all time in Midfield, for he truly devoted it to serving the people that he loved and cared for. He left many fond memories and I am sure that this fine, outstanding gentleman will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to share this tribute with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. He will be deeply missed by me and all others who were touched by his wonderful life.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BOLLING

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is losing a great man with the retirement of Dick BOLLING. Congressman BOLLING has represented the Fifth District in Missouri with distinction for 34 years and we in the Kansas City metropolitan area will miss him. DICK BOLLING interjects a degree of honesty and integrity into the Congress not often seen in one Representative. You always know where Congressman BOLLING stands on the important issues of the day and how those issues affect his constituents in the Kansas City area.

I feel very privileged to know DICK BOLLING and to have worked as closely as I have with him over the years. I have learned a great deal from his vast knowledge of the issues, as well as his well-renowned expertise in parliamentary procedures. In fact, I believe Representative BOLLING will go down in legislative history as one of the finest parliamentarians ever. Despite his nationwide reputation as a lawmaker, he never forgot the little guy in his home district.

DICK BOLLING's career in the House has been a distinguished one. He saw eight Presidents in the White House during his tenure and eventually became one of the most effective Members of the House. He became an effective Congressman because of his knowledge of the issues. DICK BOLLING is also a hard worker and anyone who has served in this great body of decisionmaking knows the value of good, old-fashioned homework. We, in the Kansas City area, are especially appre-

ciative of Dick's efforts. He is a man who commands an enormous amount of attention for the metropolitan area and used his well-earned clout in the Congress to help his home district. When he speaks, we all listen.

DICK BOLLING wrote two books on the House of Representatives, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House" were insightful looks at one of the largest and most complex representative bodies in the free world. These books are, I believe, must reading for serious students of our governmental process.

DICK BOLLING's ability to compromise with his colleagues is well known and appreciated by Members of both parties. Indeed, we on the other side of the aisle appreciate his fairness and correctness in dealing with debate on the floor and testimony before the House Rules Committee, which he chaired.

I remember DICK BOLLING's instrumental efforts in the passage of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and his work in the making of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was admirable.

DICK BOLLING came to the Kansas City area following World War II. He initially was at Fort Leavenworth in the Command General Staff School. Later, he attended what was then known as the University of Kansas City. Congressman BOLLING was first elected to the House in 1948 and during his 34 years of service, he managed to steer clear of machine politics in Kansas City, Mo. He also served on the Kansas City, Missouri School Board.

Many people in Kansas City remember Dick's work in flood control following the devastating flood of 1951 in the metropolitan area. Much of what Dick accomplished in Congress back then is still important in the fight against severe flooding.

I will miss DICK BOLLING, both as a legislator and a friend. I wish him well in his pursuits outside Congress and I hope that he continues to be a commentator on our representative form of government.●

HUNGARIANS' SOLIDARITY WITH POLAND

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues a most succinct and telling statement of "solidarity" in the truest sense of the word.

Several representatives of the Hungarian-American community have joined together to express their support for the people of Poland and vehement opposition to Soviet repres-

sion there. Their resolution, "Hungarians' Solidarity With Poland," follows:

HUNGARIANS' SOLIDARITY WITH POLAND

We, the undersigned Hungarians in the United States, raise our voices in solidarity with the people of Poland. We know from the experience of Hungarian history that:

Enforcing order by outlawing freedom is nothing but legalized mass violence;

The occupation of a country by foreign troops against the will of the indigenous population is nothing but terrorism on an international scale;

Holding individuals captive for their beliefs is nothing but the perpetuation of Hitler's fascism and Lenin's, Stalin's communism;

Condoning such acts as the above is nothing but aiding and abetting crimes against humanity, as established by international law, including the Helsinki Accords.

We, therefore, accuse the Soviet Union and the present rulers of Poland of grave violation of human rights, and demand that they immediately enable the development of legal order and democracy in Poland by:

Withdrawing all occupying Soviet troops;

Releasing all detained political prisoners;

Holding free elections to establish a truly representative, democratic government of, for and by the people of Poland.

In the spirit of our peoples' historic friendship, we express our solidarity with the Polish nation's struggle for freedom and our hope that there will come a time when all the peoples of East Central Europe can live their lives free from foreign occupation and dictatorial governments, free to build the social order of their own choice, by means that assure human rights.●

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT REPUBLICAN MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT BREZHNEV

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday February 9, 1982

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been contacted by the chairperson of the Republican Committee in the 13th District of Michigan, asking that I share with my colleagues in the RECORD that organization's "open letter" to President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union regarding its foreign policies.

Although fewer than 8 percent of my district voters are Republicans, I believe that the views expressed by Mrs. Letty Gupta, the chairperson of the 13th District Republican Committee, deserve to be heard. I would like to include them at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

RUSSIA PURSUES PRIMITIVE FOREIGN POLICY AN OPEN LETTER TO LEONID ILYICH BREZHNEV

(By Letty Gupta)

DEAR PRESIDENT BREZHNEV: The Soviet-instigated Polish crisis is acquiring an ominous form and appears to be growing into a cause for collision between the two superpowers, all because the Kremlin refuses to abandon her feral pursuit of world domination.

The Kremlin continues to boldly deny responsibility for the subjugation of Poland, and to conceal her covert invasion under a barrage of accusations aimed at Washington. You are edgy and anxious to convince yourself that people around the globe can forever be fooled into remaining passive while the Kremlin takes over country after country and turns it into a cage for humans.

Were the Kremlin an innocent observer, as you want the world to believe, you would have had no hesitation in heeding President Reagan's call to join us in a humane partnership for peace to help restore to the oppressed Polish people the limited freedoms they enjoyed prior to the December 1981 military crackdown by Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski.

Not so. The Kremlin responded to our peace overtures by resurrecting cold war tactics and by tossing out concocted accusations like, "The United States has a history of open and secret interference in the internal affairs of Poland."

The truth is that Polish history and folklore are crowded with accounts of Russian atrocities and invasions. For centuries, Russia has interfered in Poland's internal affairs, confiscated her civil liberties, annexed her territory, wrecked her economy, and generally played havoc with the lives of her people.

There are nations anchored in oceans, fastened to mountains and bounded by rivers that despite an occasional intrusion by outside forces go on providing a measure of safety, security, and stability for their inhabitants. But Poland, lacking in natural barriers, has been an easy target for foreign invaders, particularly Prussia to the West and Russia to the East.

For instance, in 1733 Russia invaded Poland and set off the War of the Polish Succession, which led to the confirmation of the incompetent August III as king of Poland. August III, a Russian puppet, brought anarchy to Poland.

In 1763, Russia again intervened militarily to ensure the election of Stanislaw August Poniatowski as king of Poland. This Soviet action led to rebellion and to the formation of an anti-Poniatowski, anti-Russian confederation within Poland. Four years of civil war brought nationwide devastation.

In 1772, Russia, claiming that the Poles could not govern themselves, dismembered Poland. Together with Prussia and Austria, Russia annexed nearly 30 percent of Poland's territory—known as the First Partition. With what was left of their nation, the resolute Poles regrouped and the pro-Polish party won a clear majority in the Sejm. Once in power, the Polish people demanded the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops. In the Sejm, the Poles passed the Constitution of the Third of May (1791), thus becoming the second nation in the world, after the United States, to have a written Constitution.

Intolerant and fearful of the freedoms the Polish people had legislated for themselves, Russia again invaded Poland in 1792, and with ally Prussia affected the Second Partition, thereby annexing another large portion of Poland. Renewed unrest and an armed insurrection rapidly grew into a national movement under the leadership of Tadeusz Kosciuszko. Heavily armed Russian troops leaped at Poland and squashed yet another attempt by the Polish people to free themselves from Russian tyranny.

In 1795, Russia, Prussia, and Austria participated in the Third Partition and divided among themselves the remainder of Poland.

Poland was wiped off the world map. The Russians rejoiced in the belief that for future generations Poland would exist only as a paragraph in high school history books.

The Russians were wrong. The Polish people's relentless struggle for a free homeland resulted in the rebirth of Poland in 1918. But, the peace Poland craved was still not at hand. World War I and II took a heavy toll on Poland's frontiers and left her in ruins. Adolf Hitler too had hated Poland and had vowed, "I shall make her [Poland] a long forgotten name on ancient maps."

After World War II, as a result of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, Poland, after centuries of bloodshed, returned to the smaller geographical borders she had occupied eight hundred years earlier. In the 16th century, the golden age for Poland, she had actually captured Moscow and by the Truce of Deulino in 1619 she was given substantial portions of Russian territory including the great frontier fortress of Smolensk. At the peak of her power, Poland had stretched out over territories three times her present size. Except for that brief glimpse of glory, every Polish attempt to gain freedom met with merciless Russian persecution.

To cite an example, of the Insurrection of 1863, Polish historian Josef Szulski writes: "Russian atrocities have no limits; in Warsaw the Cossacks butcher children, sack the houses, loot from top to bottom, destroy collections of art, libraries, put the torch to manuscripts—this in the marvelous palace of Zamoycki—throw through the window a cradle and a child, and Chopin's piano, which, cast on the sidewalk, utters one last cry of despair . . . A terrible silence falls over Poland. Europe, as always, does not budge, faithful to its policy of neutrality, adopted since the Partitions, since the Insurrection of 1830 . . ."

Now the year is 1982. Europe still remains neutral. Russia still persecutes Poland and arranges her internal affairs through surrogates. Once again, Russia is sowing the seeds of anarchy and civil war in Poland and elsewhere. Easily, the Soviet Union is the world's number one mischief-maker. All over the globe, Soviet scheming and megalomania are responsible for human despair. In Asia the Kremlin overtly occupies Afghanistan; in Europe the Kremlin covertly occupies Poland; in the Middle East the Kremlin is creating internal and external tensions, with war as the ultimate aim, through her surrogates Hafez Assad of Syria, Muammar Qadhafi of Libya, Yassar Arafat of the PLO; in Central America the Kremlin is inciting internal unrest through Cuban-trained Sandinista leftists in Nicaragua, the Mayan Indians in Guatemala, the Marxist guerrillas in El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama, and Mexico.

Humankind is hemorrhaging from the wounds of war. In other lands, tyrannical leaders are born once in a long time but Russia seems to produce them with astonishing regularity. Sooner or later there will have to be a mighty international movement to either isolate and impeach the Soviet Union or to civilize and humanize her leaders. There is no room in our world for a nation that pursues a primitive foreign policy and wants to return 20th century civilization to the dark ages of oppression.●

DICK BOLLING

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, there are many within this body that have had the pleasure of working with Dick BOLLING for more years and on more legislative initiatives than I have. But there are none that can claim a greater respect for his abilities and his judgment.

He is someone to whom I have turned often for advice, and he has always been willing to take the time to listen and to counsel.

That he is a man of immense intellect and talent is already legend in Congress. He is also a man of great personal courage. Combining these qualities with a clear vision of the Nation's future has made him a powerful force in Congress. DICK BOLLING has been way ahead of his time in espousing ideas and legislative proposals that would slowly, but inevitably, take root years later.

When DICK BOLLING retires, I will lose the association of a friend and an adviser. And this body will be losing one of its finest and most dedicated public servants. I join my colleagues in wishing him good health and much happiness in his new life.●

DICK BOLLING

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, our brilliant colleague and the very best friend a man could have, DICK BOLLING, has announced that he will retire from Congress after 34 years of distinguished service.

As deeply as we revere DICK BOLLING as a friend, we also respect him as a leader in this House. Dick has always given unselfishly of his time, counsel and vast experience to his colleagues. He is a consummate strategist who possesses a complete mastery of parliamentary procedures.

With his remarkable intellect and encyclopedic knowledge of congressional operations Dick has led the way to countless reforms. I am sure that most of our colleagues have devoured Dick's excellent books on how Congress works and how it should work. These books epitomize DICK BOLLING's knack for incisive analysis and thoughtful recommendations.

DICK BOLLING cares about Congress and the millions of people we represent. Throughout his exceptional career in public service, his intellectu-

al gifts and parliamentary skills have been focused on making the Government more responsive and effective. Among his many outstanding achievements is designing the Federal budget process and devising a plan for reorganization of the Federal Government.

We will sorely miss Dick when he retires at the end of the year, but his influence on this House and our Nation will long be felt.

We will miss his wit, his understanding and his wise counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself fortunate to serve with DICK BOLLING and to know he is my friend.●

THE 100 DAYS OF ANDREAS PAPANDREOU

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring attention to an article entitled "The 100 Days of Andreas Papandreou" which recently appeared in *Newsday*. This article, written by Adamantia Pollis, chairwoman of the graduate faculty department of political science at the New School for Social Research, is an excellent and thoughtful review of the present situation in Greece.

Having recently returned from meeting with Andreas Papandreou in Greece, I can personally attest to Ms. Pollis' accurate account of the state of Greek relations with the West, and in particular with the United States. The author also captures the essential dilemma which faces Mr. Papandreou and the new Greek Government both domestically and in regard to future relations with Washington. The points brought out in Ms. Pollis' piece become increasingly significant in light of recent reports that the administration is proposing a major increase in foreign aid to Turkey. I hope each of my colleagues will carefully review the article, which follows:

[From *Newsday*]

THE 100 DAYS OF ANDREAS PAPANDREOU

(By Adamantia Pollis)

A little more than 100 days ago, the Greeks overwhelmingly rejected a largely pro-American government and voted into power Andreas Papandreou, who ran on the decidedly anti-American platform of his Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK).

Startling as this transformation may appear, it has long been in the making. For decades, deep currents have been running counter to the superficial pledges of Greece's loyalty to the United States and the facade of economic prosperity.

The imposition of military rule on Greece in 1967 by three colonels, George Papadopoulos pre-eminent among them, intensified these underlying trends.

Anti-Americanism became more widespread and the need for drastic socio-economic reforms became more apparent. Support of the junta by the United States and American acquiescence (some say support) in the Greek-sponsored coup against President Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus in 1974, which precipitated an invasion of Cyprus by Turkey only to be followed by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's "tilt" towards Ankara, stimulated the rising tide of anti-Americanism in Athens. Only foreign investors and the Greek industrial class, for whom the junta's policies created vast opportunities for excessive and quick profits, supported the Greek colonels and their United States protectors.

The Cyprus fiasco triggered the collapse of the military dictatorship in 1974. Konstantinos Karamanlis, who had been premier of Greece in the 1950s and early '60s, flew back from his exile in Paris to take control of the government with his rightist New Democracy Party amidst a euphoria that had not been witnessed since the end of World War II. Though the junta's collapse returned to power the ruling class of the 1950s and early '60s, the damage to the old order was irreparable.

The veneer of economic prosperity had crumbled. The Cyprus problem remained unresolved and the stalemate—40 per cent of the island occupied by Turkish troops—served as a clear reminder of the perfidy of the junta and its American allies.

Despite Karamanlis' rhetoric, he began almost immediately to transform Greek foreign policy. In fact the foreign policy of the present Socialist government is only a more dramatic and forceful articulation of 1974 rightist initiatives. For though he had been a loyal friend of the United States when he was first premier, Karamanlis felt personally betrayed by the United States' support of the junta. Buttressed by public opinion, Karamanlis gave vent to his feelings by withdrawing Greece from the military wing of NATO.

His successor George Rallis, of the same party, also asserted independence from Washington. In negotiating with the United States over the American bases in Greece, he insisted upon increased Greek control and more restrictions on their use by the United States. At the same time he refused to make concessions to United States-supported Turkish demands on territorial waters and air space control over the Aegean. Moreover, he agreed to repair Soviet merchantmen and naval supply ships in Greek yards, though he later canceled this agreement under U.S. pressure. Thus Greece began to loosen its ties to the United States.

The development of a new, independent foreign policy, however, did not save Rallis from repudiation by the Greek electorate on Oct. 18. Greek voters were primarily motivated by the government's failure to solve pressing domestic social and economic problems. Although in the past few decades consumer goods have been plentiful, the overall quality of life had badly deteriorated. Urban migration into Athens nearly doubled its population in little less than 20 years. Without any urban planning, buildings went up randomly; some areas have no sewage system. Massive air pollution hangs in a cloud over the city for weeks at a time. The Parthenon, crumbling in the noxious air, has become a symbol of the decay.

The oil crisis of 1973 wrecked the Greek economy. Inflation began to run wild, income inequalities worsened, unemploy-

ment began to be a problem as the demand for Greek workers in western European factories ended, while underemployment, a chronic ailment of the Greek economy, increased. The crying need for structural reforms, for rational economic planning and for policies that would provide Greece a measure of protection from the vagaries of international trade and multinationals became apparent to more and more Greeks.

The ruling New Democracy Party proved incapable of adopting the fundamental changes essential for the revitalization of Greek society and its stagnant economy. Its commitment to the status quo and its authoritarian tradition made it unwilling to share or redistribute power. The party was unresponsive to many legitimate groups within Greek society and to the demands of their representatives; trade unions were not voluntary and free but state organs. Inequitable taxation policies persisted. Monetary and credit policies beneficial to the economic oligarchy and extensive privileges to multinationals remained sacrosanct. No substantive social initiatives were undertaken.

Change was the cry of the Socialist movement, PASOK, in Greece during the election campaign, and the restructuring of Greek institutions by adopting radically reformist policies has already begun. A foreign policy that steers clear, to the degree possible, of both the western and eastern blocs is beginning to be evident. Though the specifics of Papandreou's foreign policy have not been made completely clear during its 106 days in power, it is obvious that in formulating policies to further Greek national interests, he is not constrained by Karamanlis' world view.

For Papandreou and the Socialists, Greece belongs to the Greeks. Although strategy is still being formulated, his determination to loosen ties with the Atlantic alliance and to keep his distance from Washington, to a far greater degree than Karamanlis did, seems a given. Papandreou, after all, is not beholden to the United States, which reviled him in the early 1960s. Among the primary objectives of the socialist government is the creation of a Greek nuclear-free zone and the gradual phasing out of American bases. He has, moreover, reinstated the Rallis agreement to repair Soviet vessels in Greek yards. The differences between the previous situation and this one is that much more publicity has been given to the Socialist move and that Papandreou will not cancel the agreement under American pressure.

Greece's main concern in foreign policy is Turkey and on this issue neither the United States nor NATO are seen as allies. Although much of Papandreou's prelection nationalist rhetoric and his militant anti-Turkish statements were designed to placate the Greek military, legitimate national interests are at stake. Turkey's demands for joint control with Greece over the NATO air flight command in the Aegean, her demands for extension of her territorial waters in an Aegean studded with Greek islands and her continued military occupation of part of Cyprus are all of primary concern to Athens.

Washington, wrestling with the loss of Iran, views Turkey as its staunchest ally and security partner in the Near East. The Reagan administration has reinforced this concern among the Greeks by providing the same support to the current Turkish military dictatorship that the Nixon administration had provided the Papadopoulos junta.

Greece's membership in the European Economic Community, or Common Market,

is seen as imposing severe constraints on Greece's embarking on the extensive domestic reforms the electorate mandated the Socialists to undertake. In contrast to the dominant members of the EEC, Greece is not an advanced industrial state; therefore, the Socialists argue, an economically integrated EEC, while advantageous to the industrialized societies, will permanently relegate Greece to a peripheral, relatively underdeveloped position. Papandreou has moderated his stance on withdrawal from the EEC and now speaks of renegotiation of the entry agreement.

Unless a major external catastrophe befalls Greece, the Socialist government's success or failure will depend not on its foreign policy but on its domestic reforms; on its ability to revitalize Greek society, install a system of justice and greater equality, eliminate corruption and enable the people and workers to participate in decision making.

Decentralization of the highly concentrated bureaucratic structure is under way, as is the regionalization of economic planning and development. The ministries are being reorganized and the civil service revamped. Critical industries and credit facilities are being "socialized" (meaning that they will be government-owned with much worker participation in decision making). The tax system is being revised and the privileges of the elites are being eliminated. The power of the reactionary Greek Orthodox Church is being curtailed while the premier's American-born wife, Margaret, is in the forefront of moves to attain equality for women.

It is much too soon to pass judgment on the PASOK government. There has not been enough time for policies to be adopted and implemented. But it clearly reflects the aspirations of the Greek people. ●

MORE ON COAL SLURRY PIPELINE LEGISLATION

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, at the November hearing on H.R. 4230, the eminent domain legislation for coal slurry pipelines which I sponsored, the Reagan administration reversed the position of every prior administration since 1960, by establishing itself as an opponent of the bill. The administration's attitude that the bill posed a threat to States rights was correctly characterized in a recent Wall Street Journal editorial as "fallacious." Both the Wall Street Journal and the editors of Business Week have come out in favor of our bill as a necessary impetus for competition in the coal transport market. I would like to offer both the Journal editorial, which appeared in the January 27, 1982, edition, and the Business Week article which appeared in the November 30, 1981, edition, in support of our legislation:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 27, 1982]

DAMPENING THE COALS

Coal mining concerns and the railroads are locked in a classic feud pitting the principles of the competitive free market against the protection afforded by government regulation. The issue is whether pipelines should be allowed to compete with the railways for the expanding coal transport market. The Reagan administration, it's sad to say, is moving along the wrong track in this dispute.

The vast bulk of U.S. coal is moved by rail, at no little expense. For instance, railway charges to ship a load of coal from a Wyoming mine to a Texas utility are now about four times the price of the coal itself. Coal producers complain that they are "captive customers" to the railroads and would like to see competition in coal transport to help alleviate these costs.

One idea, which dates back more than 90 years, is to move coal by pipeline. Coal can be ground and mixed with a liquid—water, oil, methanol or even liquefied carbon dioxide from the coal itself—and the resulting slurry can be pumped through underground pipelines to utilities, industrial users and ships for export. Besides helping to develop our coal reserves, slurry pipelines could also provide direct and indirect savings in transportation costs, according to a 1980 study commissioned by the Energy Department. "To the extent that the threat of slurry pipeline competition acts to keep rail rates low, then savings can result even if coal is hauled by rail," it concludes.

The only coal pipeline now in operation runs from Arizona to Nevada and carries 4.8 million tons a year at a cost estimated at less than half the comparable rail shipment. There are tentative plans for another eight slurry lines, with a total capacity of over 150 million tons annually. However, work on these pipelines is being impeded by two major obstacles: inability to gain rights-of-way across the country's vast web of railway lines and the question of water availability in the West.

The federal government granted eminent domain authority to the railroads in the 1860s and 1870s to allow them to traverse land and thus to facilitate the growth of the West. The railways are blocking the entrance of slurry pipelines into the coal transport market by refusing them rights-of-way across railway property. Similar railway recalcitrance led to federal rights-of-way for petroleum pipelines during World War II and eminent domain authority has also been given to interstate gas pipelines and electric power lines.

The Reagan administration was asked to support legislation in Congress last year to permit coal slurries to cross railway lines. But Interior Secretary James Watt said the administration would not support granting eminent domain authority to the coal pipelines because it would violate states' rights. Mr. Watt's explanation was, in a word, fallacious.

All but one of the planned slurry pipelines would cut across state lines and therefore come under direct federal jurisdiction as interstate commerce. Besides, the only reason the coal producers are in this fix is the federal privileges granted to the railroads in the first place. The responsibility for granting rights-of-way to these slurry lines rests solely and squarely with the federal government, not in the state capitals.

A states' rights issue does arise, however, over the question of water availability. Here

the legislation would limit the federal government's authority and would in effect give the governors veto power over coal lines based on water scarcity. This doesn't seem to bother the coal producers much. They figure they can probably find other liquids such as oil to convey the coal through the pipelines.

What really seems to be on the administration's mind is the worry that support of eminent domain for coal pipelines would be perceived in the West as federal infringement in the sensitive area of water rights, even though this is not truly the case. So the administration drew back from the issue by making this false plea for states' rights. In the meantime coal producers must cope with transportation bottlenecks, and the railroads are asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to lift price regulations on coal exports. This too has the coal mine companies up in arms.

Congress will soon have a chance to redress the balance. The House Public Works Committee soon will take up the pipeline issue. (The House Interior Committee has already approved the eminent domain legislation.) We hope that Congress shows more concern than the administration for introducing competition in the coal transport market and thus, it's hoped, encourages further development of our vast coal reserves.

[From Business Week, Nov. 30, 1981]

AN UNREAL THREAT

In its concern for protecting states' rights, the Reagan Administration has backed away from supporting legislation to facilitate building coal-slurry pipelines. Although the pipelines offer the potential of considerable future cost savings, the Western railroads have successfully blocked their construction out of fear of the competition pipelines would bring to railroads in hauling coal. If the Administration is going to fulfill its commitment to develop energy and the use of coal instead of imported oil, it ought to reverse itself and help get the coal pipelines built.

At present eight privately funded slurry pipelines are stalled, and future ones will face similar obstacles. Representative Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.) has drawn up legislation that would enable private pipeline developers to use federal "eminent domain" powers to supersede state laws and gain rights-of-way. The Administration fears that this feature violates its pledge to respect states' rights. It insists that it still favors the pipelines and that it intends to work at state levels to get them built.

What the Administration fails to see is that use of federal eminent domain does not challenge states' rights any more than the frequent state use of the same power challenges individual rights. The principle that public needs can take precedence over private interests, so long as those private interests are compensated for and protected by the right of appeal in court, is firmly established. The Administration should be thinking about the welfare of the country, not an unreal threat to states' rights. ●

ONE APPROACH TO ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle recently ran an article calling for continuous, unlimited inspections of all American and Russian nuclear weapons installations by an "army of legal spies" from the other side.

The proposal is unusual and intriguing and one which its authors, Laurence Beilenson and S. T. Cohen, believe would be an important step toward preventing nuclear war. I recommend the article to my colleagues for their consideration.

HOW TO TELL IF MOSCOW REALLY WANTS ARMS CONTROL

(By Laurence W. Beilenson and S. T. Cohen)

A public offer from President Reagan to the Soviet Union proposing unlimited inspections of all nuclear weapons installations, known or suspected, of each side by the other would be the first sensible approach to arms control negotiations in the nuclear age.

The offer and its reception would allow each side to see the true face of the other. If accepted, the proposal would be the most important non-military step toward preventing a nuclear war since negotiations on the strategic arms limitations treaties (SALT) started. If rejected by the Soviet Union, this refusal might forge a national consensus for the United States to go on a SALT-free diet.

From the so-called Baruch plan advanced by the United States after World War II to the present, suspicion by each side about the good faith of the other has prevented effective nuclear arms control. The distrust has been fully warranted and still is.

Look at the prospect of war as a Russian commissar would. V. I. Lenin, the mentor of the Communist world, predicted that the struggle between the Communist and capitalist camps would be protracted, and the course of the long contest, the bourgeois nations would strive to prevent a Communist triumph by war against the U.S.S.R. Frightful armed clashes were inevitable, he declared.

England and France attacked the fledgling Soviet Union in 1918-20. Hitler's 1941 attack was the next such war. A good Leninist believes that a coalition of capitalist nations, let by the United States, will wage another war against the Russians whenever it sees the opportunity to succeed.

Glance at the history of bourgeois diplomacy and treaties as a Russian commissar would. No student of the history of diplomacy can truthfully deny that its hallmarks have been chicanery and deceit. When, in 1913, Joseph Stalin likened honesty in bourgeois diplomacy to "dry water" or "wooden iron," he was not exaggerating; the record bore him out.

The history of treaties, the fruit of diplomacy, has been just as wretched. All nations, including the United States, have habitually broken their political treaties. The United States began early. John Jay, in the

course of double-crossing France and breaking our Revolutionary-War treaty with it, said he would not "give a farthing for any parchment security whatever. They had never signified anything since the world began, when any prince of state, or either side, found it convenient to break through them."

And in the 20th century the bourgeois nations including the United States, have emulated Jay. In short, by the test of history a Russian commissar who trusted the pious protestations of the West would be an utter fool.

Now survey the situation as a realistic Western statesman. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their 1848 "Communist Manifesto" "disdained" to conceal their aims, as has every Communist leader since, from Lenin through Leonid Brezhnev. They have declared their intention to place Communist parties in control of all governments.

Their primary tool has been, and is, internal subversion aided by external subversion from Communist bases already captured, but in the end, following Lenin, they believe the contest will be determined by war between the two ideological sides. They exalt violence as the only way to win, aided by deceit, which if to advance communism, is a positive virtue. The end justifies the means, whatever aids communism is right.

And what about Soviet diplomacy and treaties? In its short history the Soviet Union has followed or exceeded its bourgeois precursors in deceit and topped them as a treaty-breaker. From the record, any Western statesman who would trust the Russians deserves to be returned to private life by his countrymen.

With such a legacy of justified mistrust, how did arms control ever get off the ground? Up to Richard Nixon, every proposal for extensive arms control foundered on the demand by the United States for on-site inspections to verify compliance. Nixon offered the Congress and the American people the lure of a scientific marvel: national technical means of verification (scientific surveillance), which would make on-site inspections unnecessary.

Aided by the aura of detente and skillful advocacy by Henry Kissinger, SALT I was executed and ratified. With Kissinger still at the helm as secretary of state, Gerald Ford carried on at Vladivostok. Then Jimmy Carter, a man devoted to peace and to treaties as its instrument, signed SALT II and submitted it to the Senate.

There SALT II faced certain defeat. Although the opponents pointed out the deficiencies of national technical means of verification, probably they made more converts by their argument that the specific terms of the treaty were unfair to the United States. Outraged by the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, Jimmy Carter suspended consideration of SALT II. The treaties, however, are still before the Senate.

During the presidential campaign Ronald Reagan attacked SALT II, whereupon Carter depicted him as a warmonger. Realizing that many Americans associated treaties with peace and their absence with war—even though mistakenly—Reagan felt obliged to promise the resumption of arms negotiations. He will keep his promise and proceed in good faith. The question is: To what end?

According to the proponents of arms control, there are three purposes of SALT: peace, stopping the arms race, and saving money. From our own experience, none of these objectives has been accomplished.

True, there has been no nuclear war between the Soviet Union and the United States, but neither was there a nuclear war before SALT.

Detente and SALT, according to Kissinger, were to induce Soviet restraint; this, he now concedes, has not happened. Neither talks nor treaties have stopped the Soviet nuclear buildup, which has proceeded steadily during all the SALT years. True, we didn't race; we ran in place. Although we spent less money when we were running in place than we would have if we had raced, the expense of pursuit will be higher than would have been the expense of keeping up.

Why then continue? Let no doughty cold warrior underestimate the sentiment in favor of peace in the United States and among our allies. And why not? Who wants to be killed? This has led to our SALT diet: Strong support for arms control by treaty.

From the beginning the advocates of arms control have occupied the high ground of peace. From this pinnacle, the most influential newspapers and network commentators have favored arms control. None of them probably believes that there will be total nuclear disarmament or that nuclear weapons will disappear from the Earth; but, they maintain, that is no reason not to attempt the control of nuclear arms.

Granted that there is a vast gulf between the Soviet Union and the United States and that their political competition will continue, nonetheless, they say, if the nuclear arms race continues to spiral, each side will achieve the power to destroy the other, which creates a mutual interest in preventing such a catastrophe. Let's try by more SALT.

Few of the proponents of SALT would place any faith in Soviet promises. They must therefore rely on the United States' ability to detect any Soviet violation, or at least any violation that would be harmful to the United States.

Has SALT I been broken? There is not the slightest doubt that Soviet camouflage has been a breach of the provision prohibiting interference with the other side's verification by national technical means of verification. Whether there have been other breaches is a matter of argument because nobody knows.

The difficulty goes deeper. We have drafted the treaties according to our ability to count rather than our need to know. We can count launchers which we can see with our eyes in the skies, so the treaties are based on launchers rather than missiles. But in order not to fall behind, what each side needs to know is the total nuclear strength of the other. This is impossible to discover through national technical means of verification.

Certainly as a minimum the United States needs to know how many missiles the Soviet Union has. But no arms-control advocate can truthfully say that we can count missiles. Former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, an advocate of SALT, admits that the Soviets have a refire capability and may have missiles to refire, but he argued, the refire process is so slow that the launchers would be destroyed before they could be refired.

Brown's contention misses the point. First, there is no law of nature which says that the Soviets are compelled to fire their missiles from silos. They can be fired from the canisters in which they are kept. Second, Soviet ICBMs, by the thousands, can be concealed in warehouses and underground, and we have no way of knowing.

They, too could be moved into the open and launched.

If we cannot count missiles, we cannot count warheads, and they also can be attached to the missiles underground. For cruise missiles, national technical means of verification, cannot ascertain their number, their range, or whether they are nuclear or conventional. We can't check quality.

Without inspection, SALT hinders peace. The best deterrent for each side is a large number of mobile ICBMs, widely dispersed. Everybody agrees that mobile missiles cannot be adequately detected by national technical means of verification. The answer of the arms controllers is not to have mobile missiles because they interfere with SALT, the same argument made against cruise missiles. All of which leads to this pertinent question: Do we want deterrence and peace or do we want SALT? Arms control treaties have no virtue except as a means to an end.

Of course, even on-site inspections can be fooled; for how can an inspector know whether he is on the right site? Cruise missiles and mobile missiles could easily escape detection.

If the Soviet Union and the United States truly want nuclear peace, each will be willing to have the other side know what the other has. The proposal that the president would make would be for unlimited continuous inspection of all nuclear installations, known or suspected, of the other without notice, day or night, by an army of legal Russian spies for our installations and an army of legal American spies for theirs.

The inspections would not be limited to declared nuclear installations because nuclear weapons may be concealed elsewhere. The offer would make acceptance by the Soviet Union a precondition of arms control negotiations. Each side would have to give a complete report to the other of all nuclear weapons. Then the legal spies would arrive and have the access required. They would stay in the other country with replacements from time to time. Meanwhile, negotiations could proceed and be continuous, with treaties resulting from time to time, subject to cancellation on short notice.

The unlimited inspections would not cease with the treaty. They would go on subject to cancellation with an agreed period for notice. The inspections would be a greater service to peace than any treaty. A treaty can be broken in an instant. The inspections would provide confidence in the other side's intentions. Even such an arrangement possibly can be foiled if loopholes are allowed, and it is of the essence that the proposal not be hedged in any way; no limit on inspections and no notice required.

Objectors will say: "This is just a ploy to kill arms control negotiations." The reason we settled for scientific surveillance was that the Russians wouldn't permit on-site inspections. They are hardly likely to permit an army of bourgeois spies.

The way to find out is to offer. If the offer is accepted, the chance of nuclear peace is enhanced. If the offer is rejected, we'll know that for the Soviet Union arms control is a game to gain an advantage and act accordingly.

The offer would unite the country. The American people have far more sense than their guardians give them credit for. If the president makes the offer and the Soviet Union rejects it, the president can forge a national consensus for peace through armed strength rather than through paper chains.

Nor is the offer certain to be rejected. It has far more chance than the linkage so

often suggested. The rationale for the Soviet dictatorship rests on its necessity for promoting world revolution and world communism. That is its Leninist mission. To expect the Soviet Union to relinquish this role as the price of a SALT treaty is to expect shrimps to whistle.

Leninism, however, does not adopt war as the main tool. Lenin expected a major war with the capitalist camp, but during his reign he avoided war, and he counseled his successors to avoid wars that risked the Soviet base for subversion. Nuclear war would be such a war. Constantly, the Russians reiterate for the benefit of the West that they do not want nuclear war. Just talk, say some Americans; sensibly true, say others. Why not find out?

It will not be easy for President Reagan to persuade the military or some of his own followers. They will claim the Soviet Union will use the knowledge they obtain under the agreement against us after canceling the arrangement. But because of our open society, the Russians now know much more about our nuclear strength than we know about theirs.

But with nuclear war a very real possibility, most Americans would follow the president's lead. We have heard much about risks for peace that urge us to buy a pig in a poke. Why not an offer for peace which gives us what we truly require: full disclosure and inspection?

We certainly need not worry about how such a proposal would appeal to our allies, who are urging negotiations at any cost. And, the proposal would be a proper answer to the foreign and American demonstrators for peace. The proposal need not put conditions on the outcome of the talks; let them await the bargaining table. Meanwhile, let's take the Russians at their word, assume they want to avoid nuclear war, and make the offer in good faith, hoping for acceptance.●

QUESTIONS ON U.S. PRODUCTION OF BINARY NERVE GAS MUST BE ANSWERED

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following commentary by New York Times columnist Tom Wicker which appeared in the February 1, 1982, Louisville, Courier-Journal.

The myriad of questions surrounding U.S. production of binary nerve gas—its effect on the U.S. current propaganda advantage over the Soviet Union; its moral and economic implications; its implications to U.S. ties with our European allies; and the dimension it adds to the escalating arms race—must be thoroughly debated and answered before Congress obligates the billions projected for binary nerve gas production in 1983 and 1984.

I, for one, feel that money can be better spent.

[From the Courier-Journal, Feb. 1, 1982]

NERVE GAS: WASTING THE "YELLOW RAIN"

PROPAGANDA ADVANTAGE

(By Tom Wicker)

NEW YORK.—President Reagan apparently is ready to notify Congress that he has ordered a multibillion-dollar program to produce binary nerve gas for chemical warfare—the worst possible answer to the Soviet Union's unconscionable "yellow rain."

Ours, after all, is an open society and the Soviet Union's is not. So we will openly proclaim—in the budget and elsewhere—that we are rebuilding a chemical-warfare capacity that we will use if necessary. But the Russians, despite solid evidence that they have developed and used toxic substances for lethal purposes ("yellow rain") in Asia, do not and probably never will admit having done so.

Many will believe them, out of hope and naivete, and the propaganda advantage will be with the Russians from the beginning. In this case, that's no small matter. Binary nerve gas, like yellow rain, is a horror weapon, effective primarily against civilians. It's lethal within minutes to anyone who breathes it, and capable of poisoning the atmosphere of huge areas for days at a time.

Americans, in fact, will be double propaganda losers in that we will have forfeited the advantage we now should have in the evidence that the Russians are using yellow rain. That evidence should be emphasized by the United States in every way and in every forum possible; so should Moscow's willingness to violate the 1925 Geneva Protocol by which it renounced the use of chemical weapons. Instead, if it develops binary nerve gas itself, the United States will dissipate a sound moral and political position.

In 1969, President Nixon renounced first use of chemical agents and ordered an end to their production. President Ford formally signed the Geneva Protocol—prohibiting use, but not possession of, chemical weapons—and proposed a world treaty to outlaw chemical warfare.

If Nixon's order is now reversed, the United States will not literally have violated either the protocol or his pledge against first use. But with Moscow steadfastly denying any involvement in chemical warfare, many will be only too eager to ask why a nation that dropped the first atomic bomb and spread lethal herbicides in Vietnam and Laos is developing binary nerve gas if it doesn't intend to use it.

The answer, Pentagon officials say, is that if the Russians have chemical weapons we must have them too, to deter them from their use. But the United States already has ample stocks of older chemical weapons; and this answer raises the military questions whether effective deterrence requires that we match the Russians weapon-for-weapon in every category, or whether the overall deterrent effect of all our military forces is sufficient.

Put it another way: Can the Russians' use of chemical warfare be deterred only by the threat of chemical warfare turned back against them? Need we sacrifice moral and propaganda advantage, add a new dimension to the superpower arms race and expand the world's inventory of genocidal weapons, all in order to deter use of yellow rain? Particularly when we already have stockpiles of gas artillery shells?

Richard Halloran of *The New York Times* reports that the Pentagon regards Europe as the likeliest chemical-war battlefield and

plans to stockpile its new gas shells there, perhaps in Britain. But shouldn't we have learned something from the anti-nuclear demonstrations in European cities and from the anti-nuclear attitudes of governments such as those of Belgium and Holland, and of the British Labour Party?

At the root of this rising tide of opinion is the fear—however ill-founded—that Europe will be devastated in a superpower nuclear war that would leave the United States and the Soviet Union untouched. Are we now to add to this nightmare the idea that a superpower chemical war might also be fought in Europe?

If so, European paranoia about American as well as Soviet intentions will be surely heightened, and the stresses that are already wracking the NATO alliance will be increased—also in the name of deterrence.

More than \$2 billion is being projected for producing binary nerve gas in 1983 and 1984 and more will be required later. That money would be far better spent—and achieve more real Western security—if it were devoted instead to research and development of defensive equipment and techniques against yellow rain and other chemical weapons, and if the fruits of that effort were made available to any and all nations feeling themselves threatened by chemical warfare.

That would make it clear who really poses the threat, and who wants to help the world avoid it. So would a determined attempt to negotiate with the Russians and all nations a total renunciation of the use or possession of chemical weapons. But producing those weapons ourselves will divert the world's opprobrium from its proper target in Moscow, while adding one more horror to those that already haunt the future.●

BRIDESBURG: A POLISH NEIGHBORHOOD IN PHILADELPHIA

HON. JOSEPH F. SMITH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SMITH. of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as anyone who has visited our city knows, Philadelphia is a city of neighborhoods. The cultural and ethnic diversity which this provides, gives us a deep appreciation of the contributions which people of many national, racial, and religious backgrounds have made to the development of our Nation. The following is an article which appeared in the Bridesburg Bulletin in December 1981. It points to the rich heritage and many accomplishments of one of our neighborhoods steeped in Polish culture.

The article follows:

BRIDESBURG: A POLISH NEIGHBORHOOD IN PHILADELPHIA

(By Mike Elko)

During the early part of WW II a young state senator from the Bridesburg section of Philadelphia named Jack Malina was seated in an open limousine with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt riding east on Girard Ave. They were going to the dedication of Cramp's Shipyard.

I recall how moved I was at seeing the President with our young local senator.

Later, when I received a Polish American calendar from a school teacher who lives in Detroit, Michigan, and discovered a reference in it to "Polonia activity in a Polish neighborhood along Orthodox St. in Philadelphia," it impressed me highly. The fact that a single Polish community was recognized by someone in the midwest, makes one aware of the Polish growth in this area. Also, the realization of the Poles' many contributions to society and of their civic pride in their community.

I took several rides and walks through the Polish neighborhood mentioned on the calendar; the same being Bridesburg. One is immediately impressed by the clean homes, stores, pavements and even the streets. A writer for the Philadelphia magazine once described the "porches and pavements so clean in the Bridesburg community, that one can eat from them."

You see many various owned Polish establishments along Orthodox St. Businesses that date back to the early 1900s and remained in this predominately Polish area through the change and growth of the community. One sees Pulaski Savings Assn., Bridesburg Federal Credit Union, Podgorski Music store, whose owner and founder was elected to the Polka Music Hall of Fame. The Slabinski Funeral Home, Miller Realtor, owned by the Przybowski family and Ideal Florist owned by Anthony Jesiolowski. Mary Zawistowski manages the Third Federal Savings and Loan Assn., and the Polish Beneficial Assn. is across the street. All of these establishments and people are of a Polish background, living, and or working in the Bridesburg community. Other Polish owned businesses are scattered throughout the neighborhood.

Not far away, is the Polish Club of Bridesburg in the 45th Ward and on Almond St. the St. John Cantius Church which brings back memories for me as I studied Polish at St. John's, under the tutorship of Mary Senk who was a very dedicated teacher in the public school system, her assistant was Genia Gunther.

St. Valentine's Polish National Catholic Church is also in the area. The church celebrated its 70th anniversary in April 1980. When the Polish immigrants arrived in the city, they wanted a Polish National Catholic Church where they could pray and be in contact with the people in Poland. It happened at that time, the Irish Bishops could not see it that way, as they wanted an American Catholic Church. As time went on, the Catholic hierarchy learned that the Polish people were right. Since then, there are over half a dozen Polish Catholic churches in the city.

Bridesburg area can boast of a young family of musicians who call themselves "The Dydak Diamonds." It is a polka band whose members are the children of Caroline and Ted Dydak, both of whom are accordion players. Their father Ted, is in the real estate business.

Bridesburg also has a large and active Bridesburg Business Assn. concentrating on concerns of the community, as well as the local Bridesburg Civic Assn.

This area was blessed with the visit of Pope John Paul II, when he was Cardinal of Poland, and many residents have fond memories of meeting with him.

Another distinguished visitor to the Polish American community was President Ronald Reagan, who then as a candidate stopped off at St. Adelbart's auditorium in

Port Richmond. His visit was well received by the Polish people and received nationwide publicity from his presence. When Reagan spoke at St. Adelbart's he reminded those present of the many Polish celebrities from Philadelphia and among those he mentioned were Greg Luzinski of the Phillies, Ron Jaworski of the Philadelphia Eagles and Tom Gola, City Controller. And on that city famous list, John Cardinal Krol.

President Jimmy Carter, when as a candidate for reelection spoke at the Pulaski Club. This is the only community in the United States where two presidential candidates visited personally.

Philadelphia is fortunate to have Joseph P. Zawarotny and T. Dydak who serve on the Human Relations Commission, appointed by then Mayor Frank L. Rizzo. Mr. Francis Gregory, of Third Federal Savings and Loan Assn. served on the Copernicus Monument Committee. The area of Bridesburg and Port Richmond also produced people of high caliber in public service such as Walter F. Pytko, Dr. Leon Kolankiewicz and Joseph Zazyczny who served in the State Legislature and City Council.

Philadelphia's Polonia produced about ten fine judges.

More prominent people of Polish descent from Philadelphia were Frank N. Piasecki, the inventor of the tandem-rotor helicopter, who has received the Phillip H. Ward Jr. Medal from the Franklin Institute. We also have Edward Plocha, Commissioner of Records for Philadelphia. A Polish dedicated Kosciuszko Foundation, in New York City, was founded at Broad and Spring Garden streets in the office of its president, Samuel Vaucelain. Pulaski Avenue in Philadelphia is Polish influenced, Eugene Pasykowski is the District Director of ACTION, Tom Gola is the Regional Director of HUD. World famous, Leopold Stokowski led the Philadelphia Orchestra for two decades. We have the Pulaski, Copernicus, and Kosciuszko monuments as well as Pulaski Park at the foot of the Delaware River. We have the Kosciuszko Home. We even have a Warsaw Cafe. The Benjamin Franklin Bridge was designed and built by Ralph Modjewski, a world famous bridge builder. The Polish National Alliance started in Philadelphia in 1880. There is also a Monkiewicz Playground. Philadelphia has a sister city in Poland, Turin, the birthplace of Copernicus.

A very important and active organization in our city is the Polish American Congress, which is the umbrella organization for all Polish American organizations in our area as well as a national organization with over 4 million members. The Polish American Congress is responsible for the sponsorship of over 15 events city-wide during the year. This group works with all other groups to see that Polish heritage is kept alive. Sponsoring the Pulaski Day parade, the largest ethnic parade in the city, they offer social services to the many Polish-Slavic people in Philadelphia.

The Nazareth Academy and Holy Family College, located in the Northeast are all operated by the Nazareth Sisters, a Polish order.

The list goes on and on, and I'm sure, in my research, I've overlooked people, places, things and happenings.

However, the Polish people have come a long way since they've settled here as Polish immigrants in the 1800s. Most of them came for a better life or for political reason. It is obvious that through the long hard years

they have made an impact, and have contributed much to their own community and to society.

The Poles are a proud people; they are persevering, industrious and ambitious and that all helps to make Philadelphia the great city it is.●

A SUGGESTION FOR PEACE

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Paul D. Gehris, director of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, has shared with me a strong statement on a bilateral nuclear weapons freeze. In the interest of "Peace on Earth," I ask all Members of Congress to give this resolution their most careful consideration. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES A BILATERAL UNITED STATES-SOVIET UNION NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREEZE

Whereas the US and the USSR today possess 50,000 nuclear weapons¹ of which only 1/100th of that would be sufficient to destroy both nations;² At present levels, all cities in the northern hemisphere could be wiped out in half an hour. Yet over the next decade, the US and the USSR plan to build over 20,000 more nuclear warheads³ along with a new "generation" of missiles to deliver them. Even while recognizing that there is no defense against a nuclear attack, the concept of "limited" nuclear war fighting is being put forth as a thinkable and possible option.

Whereas the military budget required to continue this arms race is taking the lion's share of taxpayer's dollars;⁴ Current excessive and wasteful levels of military spending undermine human prosperity at home and abroad, while providing less and less security for all. The spending on arms weakens the economy because it increases taxation, contributes to technological retardation in civil sectors, adds heavily to inflation and unemployment, and diverts vital productive resources from meeting human needs.⁵

¹ "Nuclear Weapons and Security: 'How Much is Enough?'" Admiral Gene LaRocque, "The Defense Monitor," Center for Defense Information, Vol. VIII, #2, Feb. 1979, p. 4.

² "Nuclear Disarmament," United Nations Fact Sheet #5, Dept. of Public Information, United Nations, NY, Oct. 1979. It has been estimated that in a nuclear war, each of about 400 cities in the Northern Hemisphere might be blasted by the equivalent of 13 megatons—about 1,000 Hiroshima bombs each. Most of the inhabitants would be killed instantly and civilization would come to an end in the countries involved in the conflict, while elsewhere, millions more would die from intense and widespread radioactive fallout.

³ "US and Allied Military Strengths," Center for Defense Information Fact Sheet, Feb., 1980, p. 1.

⁴ "1980 Economic Report of the President," US Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, p. 203. Military spending currently represents over 65% of all federal funds allocated by Congress.

⁵ Seymour Melman, "The Permanent War Economy," Simon and Schuster, NY 1974.

Whereas: Dollars spent on weapons systems create far fewer jobs than those spent on civilian programs. On average, 20,000 more jobs could be available per \$1 billion spent on the military if spent in the commercial sector of our economy.⁶ The Reagan Administration plans to spend over \$1.5 trillion on the military over the next five years (\$6,250 per capita)—\$180 billion of which will be for the procurement of new nuclear weapon systems. With an inflation rate of 17 percent and unemployment running at 8 percent, such increases will only destroy jobs and businesses by robbing the civilian economy of capital and resources.

Whereas all this is contrary to the Christian call to peacemaking. The nuclear arms race presents us with a crisis of faith and a historical crossroads for humanity. As the foundation of national security, nuclear weapons are idolatrous. As a method of defense, they are suicidal. To believe that nuclear weapons can solve international problems is the greatest illusion and the height of naivete: Now, therefore be it

Resolved That the Pennsylvania Council of Churches call upon the United States and the Soviet Union to jointly and immediately stop the nuclear arms race. Specifically, we call upon each country to adopt an immediate and mutual freeze on all further testing, production and deployment of new nuclear weapons and of missiles and aircraft designed primarily to deliver them. This is an essential and verifiable first step towards lessening the risks of nuclear holocaust and reducing the nuclear arsenals.

We ask the U.S. Congress to introduce a Resolution calling for a US-USSR Freeze, and that the Administration be asked to negotiate with the USSR a permanent moratorium on nuclear weapons. We further ask that our own nation take initiatives, such as a halt to underground tests for a short period of time, or a small, symbolic cut in the military budget, that could bring about a response from the USSR, remembering that such a process was successfully followed in the '60's, leading to the Partial Test Ban Treaty.

We also ask that economic conversion planning be instituted now to prepare for the cessation of nuclear weapons manufacturing. And we go on record in support of transferring the money spent on nuclear weapons to the funding of civilian purposes; and be it further

Resolved That the Pennsylvania Council of Churches will encourage its member denominations to become active in the Campaign for Nuclear Weapons Freeze and use its influence to support legislative and lobbying effort to make this proposition the policy of the United States of America.●

SOVIET ADVENTURISM IN THE HORN OF AFRICA REGION

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the recent past, one of the major areas of Soviet adventurism has been in the Horn of Africa region.

This strategic region forming the soft underbelly of the Persian Gulf region, controls access to the Red Sea and the Mediterranean from the Indian Ocean and constitutes the gateway to East Africa.

Soviet interest in this area dates back to 1971 in South Yemen which now has become the most secure satellite of the U.S.S.R. in the Third World and the only one in a Marxist Arab states. Thereby, Moscow has acquired a naval and airbase at Aden which is located a few miles off the Bebel-Mandeb Straits.

While the Soviet Somali adventure did not end well (the Soviets had to leave Somalia in 1978), in 1977, the Soviet Union acquired substantial influence over the most powerful country in the region: The Ethiopian Empire.

Today the Soviets control all of the Horn except Somalia and Djibouti. They are building an air and naval base at the Dahlok archipelago off the coast of Eritrea and are exploiting Ethiopia as a rearward base to undermine General Nimiery's regime in the Sudan which is also menaced by Libya.

In August 1981, the tripartite pact between Libya, South Yemen and Ethiopia brought Libyan development funds and terrorist know-how to Ethiopia against Somalia and Djibouti.

The relative Soviet success was achieved in part by Cuban troops, by East German advisers to the secret police and by Soviet advisers attached to the civilian and military authorities in Ethiopia. The Soviet presence must be effectively counterbalanced and contained. The invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union caused the Carter administration to initiate the first measures of containment by signing the August 1980 agreement with Somalia, Kenya, and the Sultanate of Oman for air and naval facilities for our nascent RDF.

Our policy took a low-key approach in the case of Somalia; \$40 million in FMS was promised for 2 years as well as some economic support funds which is too little to make an appreciable difference and too much as not to arouse Ethiopian fears. The latter was caused by the ongoing guerrilla struggle in the Ogaden province; an area administered by Ethiopia since 1948 after a short British administration.

The province was reconquered by Cuban troops in 1978, in a war lasting over 1 year, from the local Somalis and Somali army which came to their support. Our aid to Somalia was only increased marginally in fiscal year 1982.

At the present, the Reagan administration continues to increase aid slightly, but it has not yet defined an effective containment policy in the Horn region. It is for this reason that I, with 63 of my colleagues, wrote to Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig,

Jr., on October 20, 1981, asking for higher levels of aid and closer strategic relations with Somalia. We have received a generally positive response from Richard Fairbanks, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations on December 15, 1981.

I ask for unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the two letters and an appropriate op-ed page article by Z. Michael Szaz, Ph.D., which appeared in the September 28, 1981, issue of the New York Times and the international Herald Tribune. Dr. Szaz is studies program director of the American Foreign Policy Institute and former associate professor of international law and relations at Seton Hall and Troy State Universities.

Also, I would like to reiterate my major concerns which are shared by many of my colleagues and to propose appropriate measures to effect a containment and progressive challenge to the Soviet, Cuban, and East German presence in this region.

We must provide the necessary military and economic assistance to our friends in the region; that is, to the Sudan and Somalia. The administration performed effectively in the case of the Sudan and we have reason to believe that the crisis in the Sudan is over. The same consideration in terms of extending accelerated and substantial arms deliveries and providing economic support funds has yet to be applied to Somalia.

The Somali army, which lost half of its mechanized equipment in the Ogaden war and remains exposed to repeated air attacks by Ethiopia in the bordering areas that include most of the refugee camps, needs large-scale assistance in order to provide a credible defense against Cuban and Ethiopian forces poised at the border. Our defense experts estimate that it would take about \$500 million during a 5-year period to retrain and reequip the Somali forces.

While budgetary reasons may prevent us from supplying the entire amount, we must provide at least the technology-intensive items and must work closely with the Somali military command. We believe that Saudi Arabia might provide financing for the remainder of the equipment and that Egypt would help with Somali procurement.

Nevertheless even this limited contribution would cost more than what the present FMS levels have appropriated or planned for Somalia.

We must also increase our ESF and development assistance. Without finding some employment for the refugees, we will perpetuate an unproductive camp life for them and create another Palestinian problem. While the administration and Congress were more generous with refugee aid and development assistance—\$30 million

⁶ "The Structure of the US Economy, 1980-85," US Dept. of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Government Printing Office, 1975.

ESF was appropriated in fiscal year 1982—the effort must be expanded in fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984 if we want the survival of a stable, pro-Western Somalia.

In the past, there were two guiding examples for large-scale refugee problems. One example was the German case where approximately 12 million refugees and expellees were dumped into West Germany between 1945-47. By 1952, they were absorbed into the national economy and provided with the manpower and many of the skills comparable to the German "economic wonder." This would have been, of course, impossible, without the Marshall plan which provided the impetus to accelerated economic development and political stabilization.

The other example is that of the Palestinian refugees on the West Bank, the Gaza strip, and southern Lebanon. Generations were brought up in the camps since 1948, with little productive experience and low self-esteem, providing the manpower for the terrorist activities of the PLO in order to arouse international public opinion about their plight and lack of self-determination.

It is up to us which direction the Somali refugees will have to take. For the sake of justice and peace as well as our national interest, I hope that the administration will choose adequate assistance so that the Somali economy may develop substantially and that political stability may be preserved in Somalia.

Only by strengthening the Sudan and Somalia will the Soviets and their allies be contained in the Horn region and then, we can acquire secure access to their facilities.

I trust the administration will move in this direction and hope both the administration and the House will divorce themselves of the commendable, but illusory notion that by not supporting Somalia we may regain Ethiopia as a Western ally.

The material follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1981.

HON. ALEXANDER HAIG, Jr.,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HAIG: We, the undersigned members of the U.S. House of Representatives, would like to call your attention to our continuing important interests in Somalia and to recent developments which threaten the peace and stability of the Horn region in Africa.

Particularly, we refer to the August 1981 pact between Libya, Ethiopia and South Yemen, "the latter two Soviet surrogates whose military, economic and state security systems are controlled by Soviet and East German 'advisors'". In the case of Ethiopia, 17,000 Cuban mercenaries are also present. Especially, the Ethiopians remain on inimical terms with Somalia because of the past support Somalia extended to the indigenous national liberation movement of the Soma-

lis in the Ogaden which is administered by Ethiopia. Ethiopian planes bombed repeatedly this year Somali villages and refugee camps.

In addition, both Ethiopia and South Yemen support the "National Salvation Front", a group of pro-Communist Somali exiles in Ethiopia which is trying to subvert the legitimate government of President Siad Barre of Somalia.

At the present, Ethiopia and the Cuban mercenaries have complete military superiority as the Ethiopian army has received \$1.5 billion worth of military equipment from the U.S.S.R. in 1978 and continues to receive military aid from Moscow. Somalia lacks both fighter planes and anti-aircraft batteries.

Somalia is also threatened by the coming influx of Libyan money and terrorist know-how which will be directed against its government by the leaders of Libya and the Soviet surrogates in the Horn area.

We believe that the increased threats to Somalia must be answered by a clear American commitment to our Somali allies in the political, military and economic fields.

May we suggest that the Department of State take any measures necessary to communicate this commitment both to the Somali government and to our regional adversaries and the Soviet Union and that we accelerate our various economic and military programs to Somalia, including the early delivery of the anti-aircraft batteries contracted for by Somalia.

We also call upon the Administration to reevaluate our present aid programs, military and economic, to Somalia in the light of the recent developments in the region, especially the tragic assassination of President Anwar Sadat of Egypt, and submit concrete proposals for enhancing the security and stability of Somalia which is providing us with air and naval facilities badly needed by our RDF.

With every good wish, we are

Very sincerely yours,

Arlen Erdahl, G. William Whitehurst, Robin Beard, Don Ritter, Delbert Latta, Millicent Fenwick, Robert J. Lagomarsino, Bob Stump, Charles Wilson, William L. Dickinson, Samuel Stratton, Arian Stangeland, Robert K. Dornan, Gus Yatron, James Nelligan, Robert Badham, Richard Schulze, Thomas Bliley, Jack F. Kemp, Douglas Bereuter, Bob Livingston, Henry Hyde, Eldon Rudd, Guy Vander Jagt, Bill Boner, Sam B. Hall, Jr., Roy Dyson, Lawrence Coughlin, Jack Fields, Olympia J. Snowe, Daniel Mica, Christopher H. Smith, Larry Winn, Thomas B. Evans, Jr.

Bill Chappell, Jr., Thomas Petri, G. V. Montgomery, Charles Stenholm, Robert A. Young, (Missouri), Benjamin A. Gilman, Marjorie S. Holt, L. A. Bafalis, John LeBoutillier, Harold Sawyer, John H. Roussetot, Daniel Crane, Frank R. Wolf, Mark Siljander, George Hansen, Billy Tauzin, Claudine Schneider, Stan Parris, Floyd Spence, Vin Weber, Melvin Price, Paul Trible, Robert McClory, Eugene Atkinson, Thomas F. Hartnett, John M. Ashbrook, Edward J. Derwinski, Philip M. Crane, John Edward Porter, and Cooper Evans.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., December 10, 1981.

HON. CHARLES WILSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILSON: The Secretary has asked me to respond to the letter dated October 20, 1981, from you and several of your Congressional colleagues expressing your views regarding U.S. Government assistance programs for Somalia. As you suggest, the current political climate, especially the August Ethiopia-Libya-South Yemen Tripartite Agreement, warrants our increased attention to developments in the region. The Administration is keenly aware of these and other potential threats to Somalia, a country whose friendship we value both for political and strategic reasons.

You may recall that acknowledgment of Somalia's important geographical location in the Horn of Africa and the Somali Government's willingness to promote a cooperative relationship with us led to the negotiation of an agreement with the Somalis last year which allows us access to Somali air and naval facilities, thereby increasing our ability to respond to Soviet challenges in the Southwest Asian area. Although we have not linked specific amounts of military or economic assistance to that agreement, we have expressed a clear interest in Somalia's territorial integrity, security and economic development. In this connection we initiated a Foreign Military Sales relationship with Somalia and the Congress approved a request to provide a total of \$40 million in FMS credits to Somalia for fiscal years 1980 and 1981. This Administration's fiscal year 1982 budget proposal includes another \$20 million in FMS credits for Somalia.

In recognition of Somalia's critical air defense needs, we concurred in Somalia's request to use the FMS credits for early warning radars and air defense guns. The Somalis have recently revised their request in favor of more urgently needed transportation, communications and engineering equipment. We are reevaluating Somali needed in an effort to be responsive as quickly as possible.

Moreover, we have recently scheduled more frequent U.S. Navy calls at Somalia ports, established an Office of Military Cooperation in Mogadishu and included Somalia in the RDF exercise "Bright Star." These steps convey clear signals that we are committed to friendship with Somalia.

The military relationship is only one aspect of our growing assistance ties with Somalia. We believe that the U.S. also has a humanitarian and development role to play in providing assistance to lessen Somalia's refugee burden and assisting the country in realizing its economic potential, particularly in agriculture, which is vital to the country's future stability. Towards these ends, the U.S. Government has been the most substantial contributor in response to a UNHCR appeal for Somali refugee relief, providing about \$45.5 million in food and non-food assistance in 1981. In addition, the Administration's FY 1982 budget proposal includes \$36.2 million designated for development assistance in Somalia.

The Department greatly appreciates your interest and support for our efforts to assist Somalia.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD FAIRBANKS,
Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 28, 1981]

SOMALIA'S DIFFICULTIES

(By Z. Michael Szaz)

WASHINGTON.—By signing a treaty of cooperation and friendship, which includes secret clauses, with Ethiopia and Southern Yemen, both Soviet surrogates in the Horn of Africa region, the Libyan leader Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi acquired a new enemy—Somalia.

A communiqué by the Somali Government on Aug. 24 accused Libya of numerous subversive acts and called the agreement an aggressive military pact directed against the Somali and other moderate governments in the region. Somalia considers the pact a springboard for the Soviet Union to dominate the Horn and the Middle East.

Geopolitical implications of the pact should give pause to members and staff of the House Subcommittee on Africa who focus on the merits of the national self-determination claims of Somalis in the Ogaden region, which is under Ethiopian administration, rather than on Soviet-Cuban encroachment in the Horn.

The Somali Government finds itself in a difficult situation. Some 1.3 million refugees, Somalis and Oromos from the Ogaden, live in 35 special camps and 800,000 refugees live outside the camps with relatives. They escaped the fighting in their province, where they suffered atrocities and oppression. In addition, 3,000 new refugees arrive daily from the Ogaden, where guerrilla fighting against the Ethiopians continues.

The Western Somali Liberation Front still carries out attacks, and the Ethiopian Army retaliates by burning villages and sometimes poisoning wells. Somali peace offers, based on negotiations about national self-determination and human rights of the Somalis of the Ogaden, has found no positive response in Addis Ababa.

The refugees are a staggering burden for the Somali economy, which also has been damaged by floods in recent months. Before international aid arrived in 1979, the Government used up its own supplies to avoid mass starvation among the refugees. To carry the burden, the Government needs substantial international assistance. With the aid of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, which is helped by large contributions from the United States and other Western countries, the situation has been somewhat stabilized, but food-distribution and warehousing problems persist and transit camps lack necessary facilities. Medical assistance, sanitary facilities, and the drilling of wells remain the highest priorities. Food distribution is no longer a direct Somali responsibility. The Government signed an agreement with Africare, a voluntary agency, and the Central Mennonite Committee, in addition to the High Commissioner, and retains only coordinating functions.

Besides the refugee problem, security remains a principal concern to Somalia. With the Soviet-supported Ethiopian Army still fighting the Western Somali Liberation Front in the Ogaden, and Cubans ready to quash any coup attempts in Addis Ababa, a ground invasion is unlikely, although Ethiopians raided Somali territory several times in the last 18 months. In addition, Ethiopian planes attacked Somali villages and refugee camps repeatedly this year, causing numerous deaths and substantial damage.

Politically, the Somali Government is in firm control, although there are opposition elements abroad supported by Ethiopia and Libya that are trying to weaken Somali

unity. The continuing military buildup in Ethiopia and Southern Yemen, however, challenges long-term Somali stability. In 1978 and 1979, Ethiopia received \$1.5 billion worth of military equipment from the Soviet Union, and further deliveries are being made. There are still 17,000 Cubans, 4,000 Russians, and 2,000 East Germans "protecting" the regime in Addis Ababa and "advising" the military, state security, and economic ministries.

To this threat, Libya has been added. In the last two years, it has served as the spearhead for Soviet infiltration of Africa. Somalia aroused Colonel Qaddafi's ire by signing an agreement with the United States in August 1980 granting use of Somali military facilities. There will be Libyan financing available both to Ethiopian and Somali exiles who want to weaken Somalia.

Despite these dangers, the Somali Government responded to the Libyan-Ethiopian-Southern Yemen pact by breaking off diplomatic relations with Libya and charging Libya with subversion and with signing an aggressive military pact directed against Somalia, and aimed at destabilizing the Red Sea and Indian Ocean region. Thus, the Government took a courageous stand by joining two moderate Arab regimes, Egypt's and the Sudan's, in denouncing both the Soviet surrogates and the mercurial Colonel Qaddafi.

Washington should recognize Somalia's contributions to Western security and extend to it increased political support and provide more military equipment. ●

POLICE PURSUITS INTO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will correct an inequity brought to my attention by Arlington County officials and police regarding the law governing police pursuits into the District of Columbia.

The legislation will amend the "District of Columbia Code" to make liability in civil actions arising from "hot pursuit" into the District of Columbia by members of a peace unit of a State determined by the laws of such State.

This bill was drafted at the request of Arlington Commonwealth attorney Henry Hudson and acting Arlington County attorney Charles Flinn. I appreciate their assistance with this legislation, which has also drawn the support of the Alexandria city commonwealth attorney and police department, and the Arlington County police department as well as the Virginia Department of State Police.

Arlington County officials and police have been involved in a lawsuit stemming from a chase by an Arlington County officer who pursued suspected bank robbers into the District of Columbia across the Roosevelt Bridge. The suspects fired shots at the officer

and their speeding car ran a red light at 19th and E streets, collided with another vehicle, and hit a pedestrian standing near the intersection. The pedestrian then filed a suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia naming, among others, the officer and Arlington County as defendants.

Judge Harold Greene ruled in that case that the law of the District of Columbia should apply to the liability issues and not Virginia law. While the District of Columbia, a municipal corporation, does not recognize sovereign immunity, the State of Virginia does. My bill would afford officers who pursue suspected felons into the District with the protection of sovereign immunity.

The most important distinction between Virginia law and the law of the District of Columbia is the liability of local government units. Police officers in the 10th district are placed in considerable danger when they pursue a felon into the District of Columbia and I believe it is imperative that they receive legal protection from civil liability suits arising from such chases. It is my belief that this legislation would offer that protection to the police officers who are called upon in their duties to pursue a suspect across the Virginia border into the District of Columbia.

If the situation were reversed and a pursuit by police began in the District of Columbia into Virginia and resulted in civil action for personal injury damages, a Virginia court would give immunity to the foreign jurisdiction. But that would not preclude suit from being brought in District of Columbia courts by the injured party.

I ask that Mr. Flinn's explanatory memorandum outlining the need for this legislation be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

FACTS OF THE SPECIFIC INCIDENT

The incident which resulted in the requested statute involves the vehicular pursuit of suspected bank robbers by an Arlington Police Officer. The officer heard a broadcast containing the description of the robbers and their car. The officer saw a car matching the description and followed the car from Ft. Meyer Drive at Route 50 East to the east end of the Roosevelt Bridge in the District of Columbia. The suspects stopped their car at the end of the bridge. When the officer approached the car, the car drove away. The officer gave pursuit with emergency equipment on (siren and lights) travelling east on E Street. The robbers fired shots at the officer and the officer increased the distance between the robbers' car and his car. The robbers were going at a speed in excess of the posted limit, ran a red light at 19th and E Streets. The robbers' car collided with a car travelling south on 19th Street. This collision caused the robbers' car to hit a pedestrian who was standing on the southeast corner of 19th and E Streets.

THE RESULTING LAWSUIT

The pedestrian filed an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia naming, among others, the officer and Arlington County as defendants. It is claimed that the officer negligently allowed the robbers to escape and that he conducted a "negligent high speed pursuit." This negligence is said to have directly resulted in the injuries to the pedestrian. It is claimed that Arlington County directly caused the injuries because it negligently trained and supervised the officer. Additionally, it is claimed that the County is liable for the injuries indirectly because it is the employer of the officer. This latter theory of liability is known as master-servant or respondeat superior liability. It is a legal principle which says that the employer must pay for the negligence of an employee if the employee causes injuries to other while the employee is acting within the scope of the employment relationship.

THE RULING OF JUDGE GREENE

Judge Harold Greene ruled that the law of the District of Columbia and not Virginia law should apply to the liability issues in this case. This was because he believed that the District of Columbia had the most significant interest to the case.

Judge Green further held that the law of the District of Columbia would result in the following: (1) Because the District of Columbia (a municipal corporation) is not recognized as having sovereign immunity from lawsuits, Arlington County (not a municipal corporation but a political subdivision of Virginia) would not be recognized as having sovereign immunity; and (2) that because the District of Columbia is liable under respondeat superior for the negligent acts of its police officers, the County would also be liable under respondeat superior.

COMPARISON OF THE LAW OF VIRGINIA AND THE LAW OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ruling of Judge Greene rejects any application of the law of the State of Virginia. The law of Virginia is, in many important areas, different than that of the District of Columbia.

A. The doctrine of sovereign immunity

Virginia has long recognized the legal principle that the state cannot be sued unless it consents to be sued. This is sovereign immunity. Virginia Counties are political subdivisions of the state and share this immunity because they are not separate from the state as are Virginia cities (cities are liable for negligent acts when performing proprietary functions). Although this principle has been criticized as archaic, Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., said:

"A sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no right as against the authority that makes the law on which the right depends." *Kawanakoa v. Polybank*, 205 U.S. 349, 353 (1907).

The County would, under Virginia law, have complete immunity from a suit seeking damages for personal injuries. It is neither liable for injuries that might result from improper County training nor under respondeat superior. Moreover, police officers are considered to be state officials and not servants of the local jurisdiction because the authority derives directly from the state. (Police officers in Virginia would be personally liable for ordinary negligence in Virginia, just as in the District of Columbia.)

As noted above, the District of Columbia does not have this immunity. The district is

liable in tort anytime one of its employees is liable (that is, it is liable under respondeat superior). As a result, the District is frequently the target of plaintiff's attorneys because it is easier for a jury to award large sums of money against the District than against an individual.

The law of the District of Columbia recognizes a limited form of immunity. If the employee is negligent in the exercise of a "discretionary" as opposed to "ministerial" activity, immunity will be recognized. "Discretionary" has been judicially defined as being a broad policy level decision as, for example, a council member's decision in passing a law. In particular, the arrest of criminal is considered a ministerial function, and thus negligence in making an arrest can result in liability. It is not clear whether the supervision and training is a discretionary or ministerial function under the law of the District of Columbia.

Virginia law affords individual County officials immunity also based upon the discretionary/ministerial distinction. (But regardless of whether the individual might be liable, the County is never liable for his actions.) It can be said with some confidence that a decision as to supervision and training would likely be held to be discretionary. Less certain is whether Virginia law would extend immunity to the decision and manner of making an arrest.

Virginia would apply Virginia law principles to an accident occurring in Virginia resulting from a chase that began in the District of Columbia. As to municipal corporations (that is, cities, as opposed to counties), Virginia law allows suit if the activity is proprietary (as in maintaining sidewalks). The provision of police activities is a governmental function and no suit against municipal corporation would be recognized. The liability of any individual D.C. police officers who were involved would be determined by using the discretionary/ministerial test outlined above. A note of caution is in order. No case has reached the Virginia Supreme Court which involved a suit for damages against a foreign governmental jurisdiction or against an official of a foreign jurisdiction, and because of this there is a lack of certainty about the ultimate outcome of such a lawsuit.

The most important distinction between Virginia law and the law of the District is the liability of local government units.

As applied to an incident like the one here, counties are wholly immune in Virginia but are not in the District of Columbia. If the facts are changed and the chase begins in the District with the accident taking place in Virginia; a Virginia court would give immunity to the foreign jurisdiction. Two further principles of Virginia law that a Virginia court in the later instance might apply to a foreign jurisdiction is that the foreign jurisdiction's liability (or nonliability) should be determined by the law where the jurisdiction exists. If it is liable under its own state's law it might be held liable if sued in Virginia. Another principle that might well be applied is a similar one; it would require that the plaintiff sue the foreign jurisdiction in the courts where that jurisdiction exists. This latter principle is simply that any action against a local government must be brought where that government exists and nowhere else. ●

RUDOLPH KAMMERER,
DEVOTED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. WILLIAM CARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe the career of a devoted public servant in New York's First Congressional District. Rudolph M. Kammerer, commissioner of the Suffolk County Department of Public Works, has compiled an impressive list of achievements and a distinguished record of service on behalf of the people of Suffolk County since 1949.

Born in Westhampton Beach, Long Island, Rudy Kammerer has been a lifelong resident of Suffolk County. He earned his bachelor's degree in engineering in 1937. He worked as an engineer in several notable projects in New York State, including the 1938-39 World's Fair, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and the city of Syracuse.

In 1949, Rudy became a village trustee in Westhampton Beach. He has served as a justice of the peace for Southampton Town and been both a member and director of the Suffolk County Planning Board. From 1961 to 1965, he was superintendent of highways, and commissioner of public works in the town of Southampton. In 1965, he was appointed to the post of commissioner of public works and highway superintendent for Suffolk County. He has served in his capacity as public works commissioner for more than 16 years.

Under Rudy's leadership, the public works department has served Suffolk County well, undertaking many of the responsibilities for the construction and maintenance of facilities to meet the needs of the people. The projects carried out by the public works department are permanent improvements to the quality of life in our community. In his term as commissioner, Rudy Kammerer has always performed his duties on behalf of the people of the county with the highest degree of competence and commitment; his work will stand as a permanent reminder of his dedication. As he retires, I know that all who have had an opportunity to work with him will want to thank him for his work in the community.

Mr. Speaker, Rudy Kammerer is an asset to the people of Suffolk County. He is a devoted family man. He is a professional engineer who has performed excellently. And he has been a public servant who has worked selflessly throughout his distinguished career. I congratulate Rudy Kammerer for his fine work, and I wish him and his family many years of con-

tinued health, happiness, and success.●

TRIBUTE TO BERNIE KROM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, recently an independent businessman in the 25th Congressional District of California closed the doors to his establishment after 51 years of continuous operation. It is with great pleasure that I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Bernard Krom as an example of the fine tradition of American entrepreneurship and civic responsibility.

Bernie Krom came to the Eagle Rock community of Los Angeles from Chicago, Ill., at the age of 13. Following graduation from high school, Bernie worked as a tailor and assisted with his brother-in-law's clothing store, Robert's Men's Wear. Following the unexpected death of his sister's husband, Bernie devoted himself to operating the business and caring for his sister and her two young sons.

In addition to the business and family responsibilities, Bernie devoted considerable time to community work, including 35 years of active participation in the Eagle Rock Chamber of Commerce and over 20 years' service in the Kiwanis Club. While his contributions in these capacities were numerous, it has been his individual acts of compassion and civic duty which earned Bernie Krom the admiration of his community.

Feeling a special responsibility toward those less fortunate than himself, it has not been unusual for this fine citizen to feed, clothe, and find shelter for entire families in times of need. During the holiday season especially, Bernie Krom's kindness and generosity have brought joy to many who might otherwise have been left untouched by the acts of good will that most of us take for granted.

It is most fitting that we in the Congress of the United States salute Mr. Bernard Krom as an example of the fortitude and samaritan spirit which have forged the greatness that is America. At the young age of 64, Bernie and his wife Anne will enjoy the fruits of retirement with a great deal of satisfaction and sense of accomplishment because of the fine legacy which we in Congress are today honoring. Please join me in wishing them both continued happiness, prosperity, and success in the years to follow.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MRS. BUSH VISITS LOCAL VOLUNTEERS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk these days about the ways in which voluntarism can help Americans in need. Mrs. George Bush, wife of the Vice President, recently demonstrated that she not only believes in the voluntry spirit but is willing to act on it. In a recent visit to Montgomery County, Md., Mrs. Bush found that spirit "alive and well."

At this time I insert in the RECORD, "Mrs. Bush Visits Local Volunteers," by Sandra Arnoult, from the Montgomery Journal, January 28, 1982.

MRS. BUSH VISITS LOCAL VOLUNTEERS

Neither ice nor snow could keep away a few hundred volunteers, students and school officials who came to Bethesda Chevy Chase High School yesterday to meet a premier volunteer—Mrs. George Bush, wife of the vice president of the United States.

Over the years, Barbara Bush has been a steady volunteer in churches, hospitals, nursing homes and schools in 17 cities—and even the People's Republic of China, where she lived when her husband was the U.S. Liaison there.

Sandra Gray, Chairman of the National School Volunteer Program, cited Barbara Bush as the "zenith in volunteerism" and for her concern for the quality of life for others and the work she has done to improve it.

"The president said in his State of the Union speech that volunteerism is alive and well," said Gray, "and truly it is in Montgomery County."

In addition to honoring Mrs. Bush, three outstanding volunteers from the county were presented with awards.

County Schools Superintendent Edward Andrews said that presenting the awards to the three men was one of his "most pleasurable tasks."

"Our school system wouldn't be what it is without the tremendous help of the thousands of volunteers in the school system," said Andrews.

Richard Marriott, of the Marriott Corp., was cited for his work as chairman of a committee that is working to solve the problems of alcohol and drug abuse by county young people.

Larry Shulman, an attorney, has donated his expertise to the highly acclaimed construction trades foundation where students build a house—from the ground up—and sell it at the end of the school year. Dr. Andrews said that Shulman was the "guiding light" behind the program.

And the volunteer who received an overwhelming, standing ovation was 94-year old Jorgen Kvastav, who is better known as "Mr. K" by the children at Bel Pre elementary school where he is a volunteer.

Kvastav, who was born in Norway, and speaks eight languages, works with the RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteer Program) and is one of the four residents from the Bel Pre Nursing Home who are regular volunteers at the school.

Although confined to a wheelchair, he said that when he comes to school the children rush to greet him. "I love it," he said.

Gray rattled off statistics to prove that volunteerism is alive, saying 8650 volunteers served in the schools with an additional 1000 students serving as peer counselors or tutors for fellow students. The majority of county schools have active volunteer programs, with the average volunteer working 2½ hours each week.

And Gray said, if the schools had to pay for the services these volunteers provide, it would cost more than \$4 million each year.

"Thank heavens I didn't write a speech," said Barbara Bush when it was her turn to speak. "It would have been said already."

When her husband became vice-president, she considered other projects to replace her perennial volunteer efforts, but she decided that volunteering was the single most important contribution she could make.

Her most recent volunteer interest has been in teaching adults to read. She firmly believes that combatting illiteracy would help solve many of society's ills.

"President Reagan said that there are pages of want ads for jobs that can't be filled," she said. "He's right, but you can't fill jobs with people who can't read. Illiteracy breeds crime."

She believes that volunteering is "the most patriotic thing ever."

When she lived in China with her husband in the 1970s, she noted that the Chinese place a high priority on providing housing, food—and teaching people to read. They saw it as a way to increase productivity and improve the overall quality of life.

"We could learn a lesson from the Chinese," said Mrs. Bush.●

BILL GREEN INTRODUCES SENIOR CITIZEN CO-OP-CONDO EQUITY ACT

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will assist those senior citizens who live in a rental unit which is converted to a condominium or a cooperative. Under the Internal Revenue Code, a person who is over 55 years of age is entitled to a one-time exclusion of up to \$125,000 on the payment of taxes on the gain from the sale of his or her principal residence. The major requirement is that the residence must have been the taxpayer's principal residence for 3 of the past 5 years. Under this law, a person whose apartment is converted must live in that unit for another 3 years before being able to qualify for what could be a substantial tax benefit, even though that unit has been this person's "principal residence" for any number of years. The Senior Citizen Co-op-Condo Equity Act would allow persons who purchased their apartments to count those years that they occupied that apartment as a renter toward the time

requirement for eligibility for the special tax exclusion.

In recent years, we have witnessed the conversion of many buildings and the emergence of this trend as a public policy issue. In 1970, there were only 85,000 condo units in the entire United States, while in 1980 alone estimates are that 160,000 conversions took place. HUD projects that by 1985 there will be an additional 1.1 million conversions. This sudden upsurge has been nationwide, with particular concentrations in New York City, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Denver, Houston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Miami, and Washington, D.C. In New York State alone in 1980, there were 17,315 units converted to co-ops and, of these, 8,108 were located in Manhattan.

We have not adjusted our tax policy for those senior citizens who may purchase what, in effect, have been their homes. These people were discriminated against as renters by not receiving the tax benefits that homeowners get with interest and property tax deductions, and now they must live another 3 years in their principal residence if they are to qualify for the tax exclusion.

This bill would allow those senior citizens who simply decide they want to sell their condo or co-op to do so and qualify for the exclusion, even if they have not occupied it as an owner in 3 of the last 5 years. There is no reason why they should not be able to do so as long as they have lived in that unit for 3 of the last 5 years, whether it be as a renter or owner. The major consideration is that it has been their principal residence.

For many, condo or co-op ownership is an excellent investment. Many buildings that are converted provide a discount from the market price for those residents who buy their units. For others, a conversion can become a real burden and, under current law, a person can be deprived of the opportunity to reap the benefit of this investment opportunity. Some find themselves unable to cope with the monthly payments which are often a great deal higher than rent payments had been. That fact may simply force them out of the building when conversion takes place or place them in a situation of discovering that they are unable to afford the payments once the unit has been purchased. The latter situation may be due less to poor planning than the desire to remain in the neighborhood or to remain in the building that is a person's principal residence. In either of these situations, a person may have to give up that unit with little or no compensation. This bill would allow those residents over 55 years of age who will not be able to afford the payments on the unit but can come up with the downpayment, an opportunity, if re-

siding in that unit for 3 of the last 5 years, to receive the exclusion if they sell at a profit. Those elderly Americans who have in effect established a principal residence in an apartment unit would receive some benefit from being displaced.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this measure. It recognizes a change in our housing patterns and provides a measure of equity in our tax laws for senior citizens who find themselves caught up in this change. ●

STOP ASININE GIVEAWAYS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to take a closer look at the fiscal year 1983 budget, a letter written to me recently by Mrs. Robert Hendricks of Dawson Springs, Ky., seems very appropriate. Mrs. Hendricks wonders about some of the expenditures being made by the Federal Government in the current economic recession. I believe Mrs. Hendricks' letter is one which should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time. The letter follows:

DEAR MR. HUBBARD: My query is, why—if our government is in such dire financial straits, and I have no doubt it is, given the amount of waste even I can see—why cannot idiotic expenditures be stopped? It makes more sense to me to stop asinine giveaways instead of penalizing the hard-working citizens who have a right to expect at least the stability of the Social Security check they've paid into all these years.

I know those little checks can't compare to the ones drawn by retired senators and congressmen, but small as they are, they're sometimes the difference between being poverty stricken and just poor.

Maybe that's the trouble. They are so small compared to what the people who make the decisions draw, that they just can't comprehend such small amounts making any difference.

Also, I've always heard charity begins at home and it burns me up to hear in the news almost daily the millions of dollars going abroad as foreign aid, knowing nine times out of ten the recipient is just going to bite the hand that feeds it. While here at home the average citizen has to pay back plus interest government assistance in time of disasters. It seems odd we would give strangers, some of whom don't even like us, our hard-earned tax dollars and still have the gall to tell the American people there's no way to cut taxes or reduce spending.

I think more are not speaking up because we feel it would do no good. We feel no one in Washington is listening. Here's hoping someone starts listening before Uncle Sam has to file bankruptcy.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROBERT HENDRICKS. ●

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY, A WORTHY TRIBUTE

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have introduced a resolution requesting the President to proclaim March 18 as "National Agriculture Day." We are joined in cosponsorship by many other Members of the House and we hope that our other colleagues in this body will join in support.

At a time when fewer than 4 percent of our Nation's population are farmers and ranchers, it is appropriate that we call attention to that vital segment of America producing the food and fiber on which we all depend.

Farming today is more than a way of life, it is a basic business in the Nation's economy.

Perhaps I should put that in a slightly different way: Agriculture is basic to our economy. All other endeavors, including life itself, depend upon our food-producing capability.

Back at the turn of the 20th century, the power that produced the Nation's food and fiber was furnished by muscle power—horse, mule, and human muscle. In those days of the early 1900's one farmer produced enough food and fiber for himself and six other persons.

Today's farmer produces enough for himself and 67 other persons. Families in the world's far-flung places—from West Berlin to Karachi, to Tokyo, to Buenos Aires—share in the bounty from our rich soil and forests.

In the early 1830's, Cyrus McCormick invented the first mechanical grain reaper, but it was not until 1910 to 1920 that mechanization on the farm began to take important shape.

The farmer with the scythe and flail then became the farmer with the horse-drawn reaper and threshing machine. Another cycle in the agricultural revolution and he became the farmer with the tractor and combine harvester. Today, 1 hour of farm labor produces 14 times as much as it did in the period around 1920.

As more tractors, trucks, and automobiles were purchased by farmers, more acres which had been needed to produce feed for working farm livestock were released for food production.

As the farmer's mechanical power developed, so did other agricultural research, technology, and the farmer's know-how.

Better seeds, better feeds, better breeds became his to help increase the Nation's bounty.

And as the farmer's production increased, less manpower was needed. More people found it possible and profitable to leave the farm and take up other pursuits to help provide the goods and services for a growing population.

Technology in agriculture and the savvy of the farm families who put it to work has brought about an unparalleled productive capacity that truly is the envy of the world.

I trace this brief historical background to underline the fact that agriculture today is part of a long continuum of progress that has helped make America great. We must never allow those without agricultural interests to lose sight of that fact. That is the purpose of the National Agriculture Day resolution that we have introduced today.●

ELIMINATION OF CAPITAL GAINS HOLDING PERIOD

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● **Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.** Mr. Speaker, the past year has witnessed many great changes in our Federal tax laws that should bring beneficial results to our economy and to our people for years to come. This does not mean, however, that all of the needed changes have been made. One of the most important changes that still needs to be made concerns the capital gains holding period.

American tax laws presently discourage investment and capital formation, when in fact these goals should be pushed as strenuously as possible. One solution to this problem is the elimination of the holding period for capital gains. Such a change would not only accelerate capital formation for use by business, but would also increase the revenues of the Federal Government.

A bill to accomplish this change has been authored by my brother and colleague from Illinois, **PHILIP M. CRANE**. This bill, H.R. 5248, would eliminate the holding period for capital gains. Many private citizens recognize the need for this change, and for this purpose I would like to include the comments of Mr. Edward F. Moore of New York City:

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, signed by the President in August, has many merits but one vital flaw.

Every American citizen would benefit directly or indirectly from the elimination of a capital gains holding period. Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom are among countries that do not require a holding period for capital gains. An amendment to

the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 should be promptly considered by the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and the White House.

It should eliminate the holding period for capital gains on any kind of property owned by an American citizen. It should become effective for sales made on and after January 1, 1982. This simple change would increase the revenues of the federal government. It would also help to speed up the growth of capital for investment in new and expanding businesses.

Such a change is non-controversial and would be a net revenue producer. Among the industrialized nations, no country imposes a more severe tax on investment nor offers less encouragement to capital formation than the United States. It is not surprising that we rank last by personal savings rate, last by productivity increases, and last by intensity of corporate investment in the developed world. The removal of the holding period is not just a good idea; it is a necessary one and it should be enacted as a brief amendment to The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 and signed into law at the earliest possible date.●

THE IMPACT OF BUDGET CUTS ON CHILDREN

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● **Mr. GORE.** Mr. Speaker, countless times we have heard the expression, "our children are our future." This is a true statement. And without a doubt, this discussion about the impact of Federal budget cuts on our Nation's children is one of the most crucial examinations of the effects of budget reductions that we could ever undertake—because in our assessments of the consequences of cutbacks on our children, we can also gage, to a certain extent, the true cost of budget cutbacks. The budget decisions that are being made in the White House and in the Halls of Congress that affect our Nation's children will have a lasting impact—on them, and on the future of our country.

It is my belief, and I know it is shared by many of you, that the future of many of our children is being compromised. Drastic reductions in nutrition, health, education, and other social services programs will exact a severe toll from our children, our most vulnerable and least powerful group.

I have heard firsthand from many of my constituents, as I know you have, about how budget cuts are hurting them and their families. The outcome of cutbacks in one program in particular—the school lunch program—has been brought to my attention numerous times by parents, teachers, and students in my home State of Tennessee. The budget reductions have resulted in some schools terminating

participation in the program, increased meal prices, and fewer students eating meals. In Tennessee alone, the average daily participation rate in the school lunch program has fallen by over 67,000 students, approximately an 8 percent drop in participation when compared with November 1980 statistics.

I have a letter from a student in my district that I would like to share with you that I think points out the effects of the school lunch cutbacks on many students across the Nation. The letter was written by Cindy Williams, a junior at Beech Senior High in Hendersonville, Tenn. In her letter, she wrote:

One issue that bothers the students and myself is the school lunches. We would like to know why one hamburger, maybe twenty french fries and two packs of ketchup costs us one-dollar? Our desserts are thirty-cents extra and one pint of milk is twenty-cents. Why are school lunch prices going up while the quantity is going down? Everyone insists that growing children need good food for good learning. At school lunch prices this is not possible for more than half of (the) families.

As Cindy said, children do need "good food for good learning." We all know that poor nutrition affects both the physical and mental development of children and has an influence on the remaining years of their lives. It has also been proven that malnutrition among children leads to low school achievement. These facts are known. Yet, unfortunately, severe reductions were made in the school lunch program and more cuts are likely to be proposed in the next few weeks.

Although the national school lunch program was established in 1946, it is still needed in the 1980's to help safeguard the health and well-being of our Nation's young people. Adequate funding must be provided for the school lunch program to help insure that students receive the nutrition they need to grow up physically and mentally strong.

There are other cuts that impact just as heavily on children. I will touch on just a few of the major ones, which include reductions in aid to families with dependent children, health and education programs.

In September of 1981, the Tennessee Human Services Department had a cash assistance caseload of 66,067 families. In October of 1981 that caseload was reduced to 55,021 families. A total of 11,046 families were simply budgeted out of the program through new program requirements designed to accomplish that end. Naturally, those most affected by the cuts in this program are children. In Tennessee, the average family participating in the AFCD program consists of a parent and one or two children. In the majority of these cases, no father figure is

present. Regrettably, for most of the families removed from the program, the result is likely a deeper step into poverty.

Another area of assistance crucially important to children is health care. It is generally recognized that proper medical care is vital. And fortunately, overall, the health of children in the United States is good. One reason for this is that the Federal Government provides funding for a wide variety of programs that seek to improve children's health and provide care when it cannot be afforded. But we are also seeing cutbacks in the health programs. Many of them have been placed in block grants and then overall funding slashed. Medicaid is under attack and the program may be drastically changed in the very near future. Any changes in programs that provide medical care would undoubtedly hurt children, because the outcome would be that children whose families cannot afford private physicians may not be able to receive adequate health care. This would be devastating setback after many years of progress in the area of providing expanded health care to young people.

Finally, but by no means less painful, are the cutbacks in education programs. Since most of these programs are forward funded, the true effects of the first round of reductions will not be apparent until the beginning of the next school year. At that time, however, less moneys will be available for the education of handicapped students. Fewer funds will be allocated to meet the special needs of economically disadvantaged children. And many other young people may not find programs such as alcohol and drug abuse education, career education, and health education programs available. These programs were placed in a block grant along with many other programs and then funding slashed. State and local educational agencies will be placed in an either/or predicament in deciding which activities to fund with block grant moneys.

To make matters worse, indications are that the administration's fiscal year 1983 budget will call for cutting education aid by about one-third. Furthermore, the education program for handicapped children, which is successfully working to provide an appropriate education to millions of handicapped youth, is slated for inclusion in a block grant. Clearly, such drastic budget action will have a profound effect on millions of our Nation's young people. At a time in our history when education is a necessity, it is vital that every child has the opportunity to realize his or her fullest potential.

The time to provide for the needs of our Nation's children is now. Their future should not be compromised by heartless cutbacks in vital nutrition,

health, education, and welfare programs.●

LANGSTON HUGHES

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, last week a gala tribute was held in Washington celebrating the life and works of the late Langston Hughes. To honor what would have been Langston's 80th birthday, symposiums, exhibitions, and concerts were conducted throughout the district. Next week similar functions will take place in New York City.

James Langston Hughes was born on February 1, 1902, in Joplin, Mo. He attended Columbia University for 1 year, only to find it large and impersonal. Later he completed his education at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. At the age of 20 Langston left home and moved to Harlem where he eventually was acclaimed as a major contributor to Harlem's renaissance era. As one of America's truly great black artists, the literary works of Langston Hughes have been an inspiration to thousands. Some of Hughes' most famous works include, "The Weary Blues," "The Negro Speaks of Rivers," and "Fine Clothes to the Jew." I have included a copy of one of his most famous works, "The Negro Speaks of Rivers," for my colleagues' review.

THE NEGRO SPEAKS OF RIVERS

I've known rivers:

I've known rivers ancient as the world and older than the flow of human blood in human veins.

My soul has grown deep like the rivers.

I bathed in the Euphrates when dawns were young.

I built my hut near the Congo and it lulled me to sleep.

I looked upon the Nile and raised the pyramids above it.

I heard the singing of the Mississippi when Abe Lincoln went down to New Orleans, and I've seen its muddy bosom turn all golden in the sunset.

I've known rivers:

Ancient, dusky rivers.

My soul has grown deep like the rivers.

—Langston Hughes.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. BENJAMIN M. BENDAT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to rise and pay tribute to Dr. Benjamin M.

Bendat. He is an outstanding example of an individual who has given his all to his community.

On Sunday, February 21, at a special dinner in his honor, Dr. Bendat will receive the Jewish National Fund's Theodor Herzl Award for his outstanding dedication and service to his community. Those of us who are fortunate enough to know Dr. Bendat are well aware of how richly he deserves this honor.

Benjamin Bendat has been a Los Angeles resident since 1929. During those years, he has contributed an extraordinary amount of time and effort to his community. He is an accomplished public servant, and one much sought after for his valuable advice and expertise. He has served as chairman of the Los Angeles Mayor's Advisory Committee, the Los Angeles County General Relief Review Committee, and the Los Angeles County Social Service Commission. He is a member of many other boards and commissions on the city, county, and State levels, as well as serving Los Angeles County in the capacity of public social service commissioner.

Besides his service to the public sector, Dr. Bendat is also well known as a distinguished contributor of time, talent, and substance to civic and charitable causes. He has served as president of many service organizations. He is a past president of Beverly Hills B'nai B'rith Lodge, a vice president of the Jewish National Fund, and a life member of the B'nai B'rith International Israel Commission.

This is by no means the first time Dr. Benjamin Bendat's contributions have been recognized and honored. He has been cited many times for his public service activities, by organizations ranging from the city council to the State of California. He is listed in various publications such as the California Register and Who's Who in the West.

I am sure that you will all join me in paying tribute to this extraordinary individual.●

ARTHUR W. HATT HONORED AT RETIREMENT

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an occasion of importance which will occur in my district in Reading, Pa., on Friday, February 19, 1982. I refer to a testimonial dinner to be held by the members of the Rajah Temple on behalf of Mr. Arthur W. Hatt who is retiring as recorder of the temple.

Mr. Hatt has served as recorder of the Rajah Temple for the past 13 years. During that period, his service and devotion have been exemplary. I know that I join with the members of the Rajah Temple in commending Mr. Hatt on a job exceedingly well done and in wishing him well for the future.

The testimonial dinner in Mr. Hatt's honor is a fitting and justifiable tribute to Arthur W. Hatt who has nobly and unselfishly served that fine organization. I know that the Members of the House will wish to join in recognizing Mr. Hatt and in wishing him God-speed.●

STATE DEPARTMENT HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT ON HUNGARY AND ROMANIA CRITICIZED

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, since the fifties a talented and influential group of former Hungarian jurists, attorneys, prosecutors, and judges have been active in the World Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists. The aim of this organization is to monitor the human rights policies of the Communist regime in Hungary and to report human rights violations in Hungary to the proper American and international authorities and agencies.

Recently, the president of the World Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists, Dr. Laszlo Varga, Esq., wrote a letter to Secretary of State Alexander Haig criticizing the findings of the State Department's "1981 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices." He charged that this report—written before the Reagan administration could do the actual drafting—contained significant mistakes and omissions.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Varga is an outstanding lawyer who has practiced both in Hungary and the United States. He was the Christian Democratic Deputy to the Hungarian Parliament from 1947 until 1948 when he was forced to flee the country in order to avoid arrest by the Rakosi regime. Since then he has dedicated his public life in the United States to exposing human rights violations by the Soviet Union and its puppet regimes in East Central Europe and has been a long-standing member of the International PEN Club.

I commend this critique to my colleagues as follows:

WORLD FEDERATION OF FREE
HUNGARIAN JURISTS,
July 7, 1981.

HON. ALEXANDER M. HAIG, JR.,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, published on February 2, 1981 and submitted to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives respectively by the Department of State, dealing with 154 countries, is a great effort to promote the practice of the Human Rights. It is a unique task from a government, task that so far not any other country has tried to undertake.

I have read with special interest the Report on Hungary and the minorities in Romania.

Unfortunately the said reports have significant mistakes and omissions and especially concentrates on the misleading laws, rules or Constitutions of the respective communist regimes rather than on the realities.

HUNGARY

The Report says: "Practice of religion is tolerated to a considerable extent." The truth is just the opposite: the regime prevents, to a considerable extent, the practice of religion, to wit: the Catholic Church (70 percent of the population is catholic) and the Protestant Church (27 percent) have no chance at all of using the modern educational means—television. They can only use the radio yearly 13 hours (sic) and only on Sunday mornings at 7 a.m., which is a good time to sleep but not to listen to religious sermons. Religious teaching is shrewdly prevented by the regime and the number of students who enroll for religious teaching is drastically shrinking every year.

The regime publishes yearly 8,000 books, the Churches about 30 with strictly limited contents. To challenge the marxist-atheist ideology is absolutely impossible. It is true that the doors of the churches are open, but on the other hand, every door is closed to promote cultural activities and to educate children for religious life. In sum: the church in Hungary is a bird without wings.

The Report says that "the communist party has sought public support—through mass organization such as the Patriotic People's Front." It is a misleading statement because the PPF is a communist controlled organization, serving only the interest of the party. Therefore, the correct saying is: that the communist party seeks support from its affiliates PPF without the mass, if the mass means voluntary participation.

The Report also states that "As Hungary is a communist country . . ." It is particular that Czechoslovakian and Romanian Reports do not say that Czechoslovakia or Romania are communist countries, but Hungary. Of course, the truth is just the opposite, Hungary is not a communist country but a country under the Soviet occupation and governed by the Soviet supported communist party. If the Reports want to be more precise they should mention that Hungary is the only country behind the Iron Curtain where the communist party, its system and its ideology were overwhelmingly rejected in the 1945 and 1947 elections and by the historical revolution in 1956. The Report says that "there are approximately 60,000 Soviet soldiers currently in Hungary." This statement needs more elaboration because there are American soldiers in West Germany but the Government of the United States doesn't influence or dominate German life, but the Soviet Union absolutely controls the

Hungarian people, this being the only cause why the Hungarians cannot exercise their fundamental rights. Therefore, it is important to emphasize the Soviet occupation, especially by the Government of the United States who initiated and voted for the resolutions of the United Nations, to withdraw the Soviet troops from Hungary (1004-ESII, 1005-ESII, 1127XI, 1129XI, 1131XI, 1857XVII). Consequently, I think it is not proper to divorce oneself from these resolutions, which have not been executed as yet, and it is in the interest of the world to eliminate the neo-colonialism of the Soviet Union which is a danger to peace as well. Therefore, it is more proper to name the Soviet colonialism than to remain silent, which is a tacit acceptance of it.

The Government of the United States was a leading voice in the United Nations for the independence of Hungary as it was expressed by the late Mr. Charles W. Yost in the United Nations: "The United States intended to persist in efforts to restore the rights of self determination and independence to the people of Hungary" (GA-2787).

Besides the above, the Government of the United States promoted the Human Rights in Hungary because this obligation was assumed by the Government of Hungary by the Peace Treaty of Hungary and the Government of the United States was one of the signatories of that Peace Treaty.

Part (3) of the Report says that, "if a Hungarian citizen accepts the communist form of government and doesn't publicly oppose Hungary's alliance with the Soviet Union, he or she is free to pursue a range of thought and activity." The Report neglects to mention what range of thought and activity and where he or she can pursue it. Probably only at home.

The regime systematically destroys the national spirit and the religion, two of the pillars upon which the 1100 year-old Hungary is based. No article appears and no education can be heard of about the real history and national aspirations of the people. Nobody can form any association or assembly for any purpose. Any kind of opposition paper or article has long ago been buried. The situation is so tragic that even a communist newspaper mentioned it (Mozgo Vilag, February 1981, Budapest). Therefore, the Report should mention that not any range of thought and activity is tolerated, which serves the national spirit and national consciousness of the Hungarian people.

The Report quotes the Hungarian Constitution and many times correctly mentions that the law doesn't conform with the practice. But the Report is silent about the basic Human Rights: freedom of expression, freedom of press, right to freedom of assembly and association, although guaranteed by the Hungarian Constitution, they do not exist.

In this regard, the Human Rights commission of the United Nations is more practical. In its Report (40-A-35-40, United Nations) the Commission says that the representative of Hungary was asked how many times the basic Human Rights had been invoked by the citizens before the courts. The answer was: "it is difficult to state how many times the Human Rights have been invoked before the courts."

Knowing the communist-language it means—Never.

I certainly feel that the Report has to realistically mention that the Hungarian Constitution, regarding the above basic Human Rights, it is a generous check . . . without funds.

The basic weakness of the Report is its superficiality, it doesn't even try to see beneath it: the silent writers, poets, the misled youngsters and a country with leading statistics of suicides and declining population rate. Yes, the shop-windows in Budapest are very attractive, many automobiles are running, a factor that seems to dominate the minds of the foreigners and journalists. But the dominating force presently in Hungary is that the regime masterminded very skillful policies aimed at giving the citizens more food and less and less national and spiritual values, which endangers the future of the Hungarian nation.

ROMANIA

I don't want to deal with the Report of the Human Rights of Romania, but I have to say that, according to my judgment, it is generally more realistic than the Hungarian one, and rightly starts: "Romania is a centralized unitary state" and never mentions that it is a communist country as it is mentioned in the Hungarian report.

Regarding the Hungarian minorities, the Report omits basic data and also divorces itself sometimes from the facts.

It is important to mention the number of the minorities because their right to have a mother tongue school, university and to participate in the federal and local legislatures depend on the number.

The Report on Czechoslovakia correctly mentions the minorities saying that about 600,000 Hungarians live in Czechoslovakia (page 766).

The reason why the Romania Report doesn't mention the number of the minorities is unclear but it sure is a voluntary omission, probably to try to minimize the fate of the Hungarians in Romania.

According to reliable information at least 2.5 million Hungarians live in their historical place in Romania, which is about 11 percent of the population. This is a significant number especially if we consider that 47 member countries of the United Nations have less population than the Hungarians in Romania. The statement in the Report that: "The Government of Romania doesn't discriminate against its minorities as a matter of policy" doesn't conform with the truth, it is just the other way around: the Government of Romania does discriminate against the minorities, especially against the Hungarians, as a matter of policy.

The 2.5 million Hungarians no longer have a University in Romania and to study in their mother tongue is more and more difficult. If they want to maintain their national, cultural tradition and their religion, they cannot proceed in the Romanian life, and to practice the same is equivalent to being enemies of the State. Their publications, theater performances, etc. cannot express their history and national aspirations.

The Hungarians in Romania-Szekely had not only a great history but a significant cultural life, which was an organic part of Europe. Presently it is a part of the Romanian-chauvinist dictatorship—without any organic part links with the West.

Unfortunately the Report doesn't say anything about the participation of the 2.5 million Hungarians in the Romanian Federal and local legislative bodies. Probably it is not significant any more and the Romanians try to merge with every minority, especially the Hungarians, to serve the ill-oriented Ceausescu cult.

The tragic situation of the Hungarians in Romania was reported by many reliable sources, especially by Amnesty International, but the author of the Country Reports

on Human Rights is very reluctant to accept them, he is rather inclined to accept the misleading explanations of the Romanian Government, which attitude hardly conforms to the promotion of Human Rights.

I think nobody can question that during the last 10 years the Government of Romania has systematically destroyed the national and cultural life of the Hungarians and tried, and still try by force, to incorporate them into the Romanian life.

I feel that it should be the obligation of the author of the Report to demand, or at least to mention, the restoration of the confiscated rights, because without them it is an admission of the inhuman actions.

No nations, or minorities can survive the occupation or the dictatorship only if they don't give up their aspirations for freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the analyzed Report, although seemingly trying to promote Human Rights, in reality, mostly surrenders to the status-quo.

Sincerely yours,

LASZLO VARGA, J.D.,
President, Attorney at Law. ●

TERRORIST CAMPAIGN AGAINST TURKISH DIPLOMATS MUST BE STOPPED

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago, the ugly specter of terrorism manifested itself again in our country when Kemal Arikan, the Turkish consul general in Los Angeles, was assassinated. An organization called the Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide claimed responsibility for the murder.

Mr. Arikan's brutal murder was not, regrettably, an isolated act. A murderous global assassination campaign has been waged by Armenian terrorist groups against Turkish diplomats for almost a decade, and has already claimed the lives of 20 diplomats and their dependents. No matter what the historical grievances—real or imagined—of the Armenian community against Turkey, this is simply not a justification for the slaughter of innocent Turkish citizens around the world.

The Turkish consul general's tragic death demonstrates once again that the fate and future of the United States and Turkey are closely intertwined. Clearly, the fight against terrorism is one of the many common interests shared by both countries. I need not remind my colleagues that the slaying of Mr. Arikan occurred during the same week as the rescue of General Dozier, and only a few weeks after the murder of a U.S. military attaché in Paris.

I am particularly disturbed by the fact that three of the successful assassination attempts, as well as several other unsuccessful attempts, have been in the United States. This situa-

tion cannot be allowed to continue. As a first step, I call upon the Reagan administration to immediately implement whatever security measures are necessary to protect the lives of Turkish diplomats and their families stationed in the United States. It is inconceivable that any more Turkish diplomats must sacrifice their lives before the United States provides them with the protection to which they are entitled.

Second, and equally important, the administration must strengthen its counterintelligence operations in order to ruthlessly root out all terrorist groups operating on American soil. Hopefully, the arrest of suspects in Mr. Arikan's case will help uncover additional information about other terrorists and lead to further arrests.

Finally, the United States must take the lead in mobilizing our allies around the world to redouble their efforts to combat the scourge of international terrorism and end this global blight once and for all. ●

BUY AMERICAN—IF YOU CAN!

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, after more than a decade of mounting trade deficits, during which they witnessed the demise of many American manufacturers whose products once were household words, the American consumer has become convinced this Nation needs a "Buy American" policy for the good of the American people.

The consumers want to do their part in establishing such a policy. But, they have encountered two obstacles in their search for American-made goods.

First, many products they seek are no longer available under American names. They have been forced off the shelves by foreign brands. Second, the cost of the American item frequently is higher than its foreign counterpart. Many of us here are all too familiar with the pricecutting practices employed by foreign firms to undercut and eliminate American competition. Government subsidization of foreign industries to lower production costs and the illegal dumping of those goods on the American market has proved a bitter revelation for those of us who truly believe in the concept of free enterprise and fair trade.

Art Buchwald, the noted American satirist, touched on the dilemma faced by domestic consumers in an article which appeared in the February 9 issue of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. The item is a stinging truism and I applaud the writer's observation.

I have never met Mr. Buchwald, although I frequently read his column, but I am inserting his piece into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues. I do so with the fervent hope the article is a product of his own ability—and not that of a foreign ghost writer.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Feb. 9, 1982]

BUY AMERICAN—UNLESS IT COSTS TOO MUCH
(By Art Buchwald)

"There is only one way the country is going to get on its feet," said Baleful.

"How's that?" I asked as we drank coffee in his office at the Baleful Refrigerator Company.

"The consumer has to start buying American," he said, slamming his fist down on the desk. "Every time an American buys a foreign refrigerator it costs one of my people his job. And every time one of my people is out of work it means he or she can't buy refrigerators."

"It is a vicious circle," I said.

Baleful's secretary came in. "Mr. Thompson, the steel broker, is on the phone."

My friend grabbed the receiver, "Thompson, where the hell is that steel shipment from Japan that was supposed to be in last weekend? . . . I don't care about bad weather. We're almost out of steel and I'll have to close down the refrigerator assembly line next week. If you can't deliver when you promise, I'll find myself another broker."

"You get your steel from Japan?" I asked Baleful.

"Even with shipping costs, their price is still lower than steel made in Europe. We used to get all our sheets from Belgium, but the Japanese are now giving them a run for their money."

The buzzer on the phone alerted Baleful. He listened for a few moments and then said, "Excuse me, I have a call from Taiwan . . . Buster, how are you coming with those door handles for the Mark Four? Look, R&D has designed a new push-button door handle and we're going to send the specs to you. Tell Mr. Chow if his people send us a sample of one, and he can make it for us at the same price as the old handle, we'll give his company the order."

A man came in with a plastic container and said, "Mr. Baleful, you said you wanted to see one of these before we ordered them. They are the containers for the ice maker in the refrigerator."

Baleful inspected it carefully and banged it on the floor a couple of times. "What's the price on it?"

"Hong Kong can deliver at \$2 a tray and Dong-Fu Plastics in South Korea said they can make it for \$1.70."

"It's just a plastic tray. Take the South Korean bid. We'll let Hong Kong supply us with the shelves for the freezer. Any word on the motors?"

"There's a German company in Brazil that just came out with a new motor and it's passed all our tests, so Johnson has ordered 50,000."

"Call Cleveland Motors and tell them we're sorry but the price they quoted us was just too high."

"Yes, sir," the man said and departed.

The secretary came in again and said, "Harry telephoned and wanted to let you know the defrosters just arrived from Finland. They're unloading the box cars now."

"Good. Any word on the wooden crates from Singapore?"

"They're at the dock in Hoboken."
"Thank heaven. Cancel our order from Boise Cascade."
"What excuse should I give them?"
"Tell them we made a mistake in our inventory or we're switching to fiberglass. I don't care what you tell them."

Baleful turned to me. "Where were we?"
"You were saying that if the consumer doesn't start buying American this country is going to be in a lot of trouble."

"Right. It's not only his patriotic duty, but his livelihood that's at stake. I'm going to Washington next week to tell the Senate Commerce Committee if they don't get off the stick there isn't going to be a domestic refrigerator left in this country. We're not going to stay in business for our health."

"Pour it on them," I urged him.
Baleful said, "Come out with me into the showroom."

I followed him. He went to his latest model, and opened the door. "This is an American refrigerator made by the American worker, for the American consumer. What do you have to say to that?"

"It's beautiful," I said. "It puts the foreign imports to shame." ●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT BURNS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor and appreciation of a truly remarkable man. Robert McCrea Burns, farm adviser at the University of California Cooperative Extension, in Ventura County, who retired December 31, 1981, after 29 years of dedicated service.

During his career of nearly 30 years he contributed substantially to the economic and educational success of the agriculture industry. He has authored a multitude of vital publications on citrus and avocado production, through which he has tirelessly served his constituents in a skillful and professional manner. His expertise has been exhibited continuously throughout his illustrious career; he established himself as an authority in his field in Ventura County, Calif., Florida, and internationally as well.

His contributions and accomplishments instill a great sense of pride in all who know him and have been affected by his significant career. I highly commend this outstanding citizen. ●

THE TRAGEDY OF HAITIAN REFUGEES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my col-

leagues in the House a moving homily delivered during a recent memorial service for Haitian refugees who have died in tragic circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the 26th Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent, includes a substantial Haitian-American population. I have met with the leaders of that community on numerous occasions, and have, to the best of my ability, represented their views to the executive branch and to my colleagues in the Congress.

It is clear that the plight of Haitian refugees is a tragic one. The deaths of 33 Haitian refugees so close to our shores last October represents, regrettably, only the tip of the iceberg as far as deaths of Haitian refugees is concerned. I will continue to make every effort to assure that the plight of Haitian refugees is addressed in a humanitarian spirit.

I insert the homily, delivered by Father Smith Jeannot on October 31, 1981, at St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, Spring Valley, N.Y., at this point in the RECORD:

SPRING VALLEY, N.Y.,

October 31, 1981.

DEAR AMERICAN FRIENDS: You are here today to comfort us in our sorrow and to pray with us for the 33 Haitian refugees who drowned off the coast of Florida last Monday. We appreciate your gesture and we thank you for coming; we are very grateful to you. Your presence here is a token of friendship from the American community of Rockland County to the Haitian people.

Let me remind you that Haiti and U.S.A. have many things in common. We share the same spirit of independence, freedom, liberty, and justice for all. That is why, while we were engaged in our own war of Independence against the greatest army of Europe—The French Army—we sent about eight hundred (800) of our best soldiers to take part in your struggle against the British Army. Among them was our great hero Henry Christophe, who later became King Henry, the ruler of the northern part of Haiti until 1820.

As you may have known, Haitian soldiers played a decisive role in the Battle of Savannah in Georgia. It was on January 1, 1804, that Haiti became the second free nation in the Western Hemisphere. Despite many problems facing our young nation, we exported our revolution by helping Francisco Miranda and Simon Bolivar and others to free Venezuela and other countries in South America.

As you see, our greatest dreams are independence, freedom, liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice for all.

Unfortunately, today we do not enjoy freedom at home, and our beloved Haiti is a joke. We are experiencing one of the worst dictatorships in the history of mankind. Thousands of innocent people are killed or jailed indefinitely for nothing. Under this terrible dictatorship, Haiti has become one of the poorest nations in the world. People who do not support the regime have to make a terrible choice: either leave the country, keep quiet or die. That is why we are forced to leave our beautiful country; a land of dream, a country of eternal spring. Now, about one million Haitians live abroad.

Today, we badly need your support, your friendship and your understanding. We need the support of all civilized nations in the world. We hope that democratic nations will welcome the Haitian refugees and stop helping the Haitian dictator to remain in Power. Above all, we hope that you will export in a just, democratic and peaceful way, your great revolution.

May God Bless You!!

Rev. Father Smith Jeannot.

H.R. 3269

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, after careful study of H.R. 3269, the Malt Beverage Interbrand Competition Act, I have decided to cosponsor this bill. It is designed to enhance competition by allowing manufacturers and distributors to enter territorial agreements where there is a substantial amount of competition with other brands in the area. At first this appeared to me to be a contradiction in terms under our current antitrust policy. However, after taking a look at the marketplace, I have revised my thoughts.

Michigan law requires brewers to provide territorial agreements to licensed wholesalers. As a result, many wholesalers exist to provide the State with a quality product and secure jobs. By comparison, in States without territorial agreements, the use of predatory sales practices at the distribution level have resulted in the closing of numerous small retailers and wholesalers. This indicates to me that where there is stiff competition between brands, the existence of territorial agreements will increase competition in the long run because more distributors will exist to compete with the distributors of other brands. Without territories, a few powerful distributors can drive their competition out of business. In Michigan, where jobs and a quality product are essential, the Interbrand Competition Act is necessary. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring H.R. 3269.●

LEECH LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION'S NEW BUSINESS COMPLEX

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1982, the Leech Lake Indian Reservation, Cass Lake, Minn., celebrated the grand opening of its newly remodeled Che-Wa-Ka-E-Gon (Big House) Business Complex. The complex contains a restaurant, a serv-

ice station, and a supermarket and provides some 40 jobs for the reservation.

It was a pleasure to be one of the guest speakers at the grand opening of Che-Wa-Ka-E-Gon, along with Minnesota State Senators Jerry Willet and Skip Humphrey. I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks of Hartley White, chairman, Leech Lake Reservation Business Committee, at the opening of the business complex. Mr. White's remarks follow:

On behalf of the Leech Lake Reservation Business Committee, I welcome you all here today to celebrate the grand opening of this new business complex, Che-Wa-Ka-E-Gon.

Since the Indian Education and Self-Determination Act became law, new life on our reservation has been started and our children are afforded sound education experiences. But now we are faced with a crisis. The country is in a recession, many of our people are on unemployment, and the administration of Ronald Reagan threatens the political status of tribal government throughout the United States.

This new building, the 82 H.U.D. homes, and the new Bug (Chief Bug-O-Nay-Ge-Shig) School are all Economic Development projects borne out of the past administration—I want to make that very clear. I don't want Mr. Reagan to get any credit for this project.

It is our sincere hope that in the near future programs and policies that meet the needs of all poor people will once again flourish. This complex is a good example of what people and government can accomplish by working together. H.U.D., E.D.A., B.I.A., the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission and the Leech Lake Tribal Council all joined together to finance this project. I myself feel very confident that with good people like my friends State Senator Jerry Willet, State Senator Skip Humphrey and Congressman Jim Oberstar, this country will once again get back on the course that had been established by Franklin D. Roosevelt and professed by the late Hubert Humphrey.

Without the help of our friend, Jim Oberstar, this building may never have been built. He has fought long and hard for the rights of Indians on the E.D.A. Subcommittee and he is a strong believer in Indian fishing rights and Indian education.●

ENERGY CONSUMER REGULATORY REFORM ACT

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the Energy Consumer Regulatory Reform Act of 1982. This important regulatory reform initiative is cosponsored by my colleagues, Messrs. GRAMM, LOEFFLER, TAUZIN, BROYHILL, COLLINS, DANNE-MEYER, CORCORAN, and BROWN.

This bill would reform seven separate energy regulatory statutes which have burdened small businesses, cost energy consumers millions of dollars,

and distorted the marketplace for alternative energy and energy conservation products and services over the last 6 years. The following is a synopsis of the bill's provisions:

OUTLINE OF "ENERGY CONSUMER REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1982"

SECTION 1—SHORT TITLE

SECTION 2—FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SECTION 3—REPEAL OF BUILDING ENERGY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (TITLE III OF ECPA)

The Building Energy Performance Standards regulatory authority would be repealed. Authority for DOE to provide technical assistance to the building industry would continue under the "Buildings and Community Systems" portion of the DOE Authorization bill.

SECTIONS 4 AND 5—REPEAL OF RESIDENTIAL AND APARTMENT CONSERVATION SERVICE (TITLE II OF NECPA, TITLE V OF THE ENERGY SECURITY ACT)

Federal statutes which mandate that electric and gas utilities offer energy audits to residents and commercial building operators under burdensome regulatory standards would be eliminated. Existing utility energy audit programs could continue under State and local law.

SECTION 6—REPEAL OF CONSUMER APPLIANCE EFFICIENCY STANDARDS (TITLE III OF ECPA)

DOE authority to regulate the energy efficiency of consumer appliances would be repealed. The requirement that consumer appliances display energy efficiency labels would be continued.

SECTION 7—REPEAL OF DOE INTERVENTION AUTHORITY AND NATIONAL RETAIL ELECTRIC RATE STANDARDS (PURPA)

Sections of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 which authorize DOE to intervene in State utility proceedings and which mandate consideration of national retail electric rate standards would be repealed. DOE intervention in State utility proceedings intrudes on matters exclusively the concern of State and local governments, and most State utility commissions have completed their consideration of national retail electric rate standards. Section 210 of PURPA regarding small power producers and cogeneration would be retained.

SECTION 8—REPEAL OF INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSERVATION REPORTING REGULATIONS (TITLE III OF ECPA)

The industrial energy conservation reporting requirements, which burden businesses with needless and duplicative paperwork, would be repealed. The industrial sector has been the top achiever in energy conservation compared to all other sectors since the 1973 Arab oil embargo. The Federal government has no business imposing additional regulatory burdens on industry unrelated to public health or safety. Voluntary industry reporting of energy conservation gains would continue.

SECTION 9—REPEAL OF EMERGENCY ENERGY CONSERVATION ACT

DOE stand-by authority to preempt State and local energy emergency consumption targets would be repealed. Presidential authority to allocate energy supplies in an emergency would not be affected by repeal of this regulatory authority.

This regulatory reform legislation would also reaffirm that State and local governments—not the Federal

bureaucrats—have the primary responsibility to regulate public utility rates. Too often in the last several years, Federal officials have intervened in electric and gas utility rate proceedings, and the ratepayers and consumers have ended up paying for their intermeddling.

My bill is truly a regulatory reform package for the people—the small businesses, the retailers, the hard-pressed homebuilders and realtors, the electric consumers, the insulation and plumbing and heating contractors, and the energy conservation and renewable energy entrepreneurs. They are all subject to the needless, burdensome regulatory statutes reformed by my bill—Federal statutes which would mandate building standards, drive expensive home appliances off the market, require small energy consumers to subsidize duplicative energy conservation programs, or place energy conservation entrepreneurs and State and local energy officials in a strait-jacket of Federal regulation and paperwork.

In my home State of California, a leader in experimental approaches to energy conservation, many have questioned the need for many of these regulations. For example, insulation contractors have filed suit against the Residential Conservation Service because of its anticompetitive impacts.

My bill would also save tax dollars and assure that the scarce Federal dollars available for energy are more prudently spent on long-term R. & D. and low-income assistance, not on Federal regulations which duplicate the free market. My bill would save \$190 million in Federal expenditures for these programs between fiscal 1982 and 1984, compared to fiscal 1981 projections.

Regulatory reform is a cornerstone of President Reagan's economic recovery program, and many of the statutes in my bill have been targeted for review or reform by Vice President BUSH's Regulatory Relief Task Force.

I believe the Energy Consumer Regulatory Reform Act of 1982 will be a significant part of the regulatory reform agenda of the 97th Congress.

H.R. —

A bill to reform the Federal regulation of energy use and allocation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Energy Consumer Regulatory Reform Act of 1982".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Government, through restrictions on the use and allocation of energy resources, has increased energy costs to consumers;

(2) the costs to energy consumers of Government restrictions on the use and allocation

of energy resources exceed the consumer benefits in terms of energy saved and National security;

(3) Federal energy restrictions impose massive paperwork and compliance burdens on energy distributors, public utilities, and energy producers, the costs of which are ultimately borne by energy consumers;

(4) Government restrictions on energy use and allocation have created artificial energy shortages, reduced competition among businesses, increased inflation in energy prices, and contributed to the financial instability of public utilities;

(5) State and local governments should be primarily responsible for the regulation of energy conservation activities by public utilities, the building industry, energy producers and developers, small businesses, and energy consumers; and

(6) reform of Government restrictions on energy use and allocation is in the interest of public health, safety and welfare, would reduce consumer energy costs, and would provide for a more equitable and efficient allocation of energy resources among citizens in the National economy.

(b) The purpose of this Act is—

(1) to reduce energy costs to consumers;

(2) to reform the regulation by the Federal Government of energy use and allocation;

(3) to foster competition;

(4) to eliminate Government waste, paperwork, and unnecessary spending;

(5) to provide more equitable and efficient allocation of energy resources among citizens; and

(6) to restore balance between the Federal Government and the State and local governments in the regulation of energy use and allocation.

LEAST-COST BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by striking out title III, relating to building energy performance standards.

(b) The National Energy Conservation Policy Act is amended—

(1) in part 2 of title II, by striking out section 231, and in section 233, by striking out "part A of the Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976,"; and

(2) in the table of contents, by striking out the item relating to section 231 of part 2 of title II.

(c) Paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 504(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting "(as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of the Energy Consumer Regulatory Reform Act of 1982)" after "Existing Buildings Act of 1976" each place it appears.

(d)(1) Section 103 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5801) is amended by striking out paragraph (7), and by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (12) as paragraphs (7) through (11), respectively.

(2) Section 108 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5818) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period in lieu thereof, and by striking out paragraph (4); and

(B) by striking out subsection (e).

FULL COMPETITION IN RESIDENTIAL ENERGY CONSERVATION

SEC. 4. (a) The National Energy Conservation Policy Act is amended—

(1) in title II, by striking out part 1, relating to residential energy conservation; and

(2) in the table of contents, by striking out the items relating to part 1 of title II.

(b) The Energy Security Act is amended—

(1) in title V, by striking out subtitle B, relating to the residential conservation service; and

(2) by striking out the items in the table of contents relating to subtitle B of title V.

FULL COMPETITION IN COMMERCIAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

SEC. 5. (a) The National Energy Conservation Policy Act is amended—

(1) by striking out title VII, relating to the commercial and apartment conservation service; and

(2) in the table of contents, by striking out the items relating to title VII.

(b) The Energy Security Act is amended—

(1) in title V, by striking out subtitle D, relating to the commercial and apartment conservation service; and

(2) by striking out the items in the table of contents relating to subtitle D of title V.

LEAST-COST CONSUMER APPLIANCE EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

SEC. 6. The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) by striking out sections 321(a)(6); 325; 326(b)(3)(A); 329; 332(a)(5); 333; 335; 336(a)(2); 337; and 339; and subsections (a)(2), (b), and (c) of section 327, relating to energy conservation program for consumer products other than automobiles; and

(2) in section 326(b)(5), strike reference to section 325; in section 324, strike reference to section 325; in section 336(a), strike reference to sections 325(a) and 327(b); in section 336(b)(1) and (2), strike reference to section 325.

ASSURING THE INDEPENDENCE OF STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) by striking out titles I and III, relating to retail regulatory policies for electric utilities and gas utilities;

(2) by striking out section 603, relating to the utility regulatory institute; and

(3) by striking out the items in the table of contents relating to—

(A) titles I and III; and

(B) section 603.

(b) The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by striking out title II, relating to electric utilities rate design initiatives.

VOLUNTARY INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSERVATION REPORTING PROGRAM

SEC. 8. The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) by striking out parts C and E of title III, relating to industrial energy conservation; and

(2) in the table of contents, by striking out the items relating to parts C and E of title III.

INDEPENDENT STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY TO MEET ENERGY EMERGENCIES

SEC. 9. (a) The Emergency Energy Conservation Act of 1979 is hereby repealed.

(b) The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) by striking out part A of title II, relating to general emergency authorities; and

(2) by striking out the items in the table of contents relating to part A of title II. ●

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, throughout the month of February, millions of black Americans across the United States are gathering in commemoration of Black History Month. Back in my own district, several events are planned in honor of those black Americans who, through their courage and selfless dedication, have made significant contributions in helping to erase the bonds of poverty and economic deprivation visited upon minorities and other under-represented Americans.

On February 26, 1982, I have the privilege of serving as honorary chairperson of one such event. The Greater Watts Willowbrook Chamber of Commerce is holding a banquet on that evening and will honor a gentleman who best epitomizes those qualities we all strive for in service to humanity. Concerned, benevolent, dedicated, and committed are just a few of the adjectives that come to mind when one hears the name of the Reverend Frederick Douglass Ferrell. Founder and pastor of Tabernacle Faith Baptist Church in Los Angeles and Watts' first black legislator, Reverend Ferrell will be honored by the citizens of Los Angeles on the evening of the 26th. It is especially fitting that he is being honored during this month and, in recognition of Reverend Ferrell's outstanding achievements, I would like to use this occasion to share with my colleagues just a few of his distinguished accomplishments.

The youngest of five children, F. Douglass Ferrell was born on February 21, 1915, to Robert and Willie Lee Ferrell in Gonzales County, Tex. At the age of 5, young Ferrell's family moved to San Antonio, Tex., where Douglass attended elementary and secondary schools.

At the age of 7, Ferrell realized his destiny to serve mankind through the ministry. Delivering his first sermon at the age of 18, Ferrell went on to Bishop College in Marshall, Tex., followed by studies at the Los Angeles Theological Seminary. And in 1936, at the tender age of 21, F. Douglass Ferrell was ordained a Baptist minister.

The members of the congregation of the Progressive Baptist Church in Berkeley, Calif., were the first recipients of Reverend Ferrell's ministry. Following 2 years at Progressive, Ferrell moved to Los Angeles where for the next 3 years he would serve as pastor of Macedonia Baptist Church.

Encouraged by the prayers and loyalty of 38 devout Christians, in 1944 Reverend Ferrell founded the Taber-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nacle Faith Baptist Church. Although initial services were conducted in a lodge and later in a tent, services today are held in an imposing edifice designed and constructed primarily by Rev. F. Douglass Ferrell.

For the past 37 years, Reverend Ferrell's most ardent supporter has been his lovely wife, Mrs. Esther Mae Ferrell. Married on June 10, 1945, the Ferrells are the proud parents of two sons, Frederick, Jr., and Sheridan Robert, and a daughter, Stephanie Camille. The family is further enriched by the presence of grandchildren.

With an insatiable concern for his fellow man and the belief that the underprivileged must pool their resources and knowledge if they are to prosper economically, in 1953 Reverend Ferrell founded the Tabernacle Faith Federal Credit Union. Today, this organization provides a full range of services to families of Tabernacle Faith Baptist Church.

Reverend Ferrell's providence and insight has been felt by the youth of his community as well. Beginning with five young people from various high schools in Los Angeles in 1960, he founded Teen Age World. A cooperative venture, Teen Age World was established on Reverend Ferrell's "5-C" principle: Christ, character, capability, capital, and cooperation. Teen Age World saw as its chief mission to prevent rather than cure juvenile delinquency by providing youths with an opportunity for creative and constructive entrance into the adult world. The organization's first business venture was a clothing store, which provided its youthful members with both experience in the consumer market and an income as well.

In 1956, Reverend Ferrell explained his ministry to the Western Hemisphere with the establishment of a church mission in Jamaica, West Indies. For over 25 years, Ferrell's selfless mission program has extended a helping hand to hundreds of Jamiaca's downtrodden by providing clothing to the naked and food to the poor.

There is more.

A man of great vision and wisdom, a man consumed with a desire to help his fellow man unshackle the bonds of poverty, prejudice, fear, and hopelessness, in 1962 Reverend Ferrell opted for an alternative approach to curing society's ills when he entered the political arena and unseated a 25-year incumbent in the California Legislature. This achievement earned Reverend Ferrell the distinction of becoming the first black man elected to the California State Legislature from the 55th Assembly District.

With great aplomb and honor, Assemblyman Ferrell served the citizens of the 55th Assembly District for two terms before voluntarily retiring in December 1966.

February 9, 1982

On February 26, 1982, fellow clergymen, citizens of Los Angeles, and friends will gather to pay homage to this gentleman of firsts. His life has served as an inspiration to all having enjoyed the privilege of his association. The recipient of numerous awards from government, fraternal orders, clubs, churches, and even a few honorary doctorate degrees, the most cherished award possessed by this great humanitarian is the legacy he has created for mankind. I am pleased to have the opportunity to be associated with him on the occasion of this, his finest hour.●

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we adopt the supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The appropriation is to be used to reimburse the CCC for net realized losses, which now total \$5.3 billion. Primarily due to today's poor market conditions, the record 1981 crop yields, and increases in commodity program loan and purchase rates, the CCC's funds have been severely depleted. Its borrowing authority is down to about \$600 million.

Without this appropriation the CCC may be forced in the very near future to suspend its loan and deficiency payment operations. This would be a disaster for the farmers of America, who have already suffered from the extremely low prices received this year. I am particularly concerned with the plight of the small farmers, many of whom may well be driven out of business if they are unable to obtain needed financing from the CCC.

It is no exaggeration to say that farmers are the backbone of America, and to not enact this appropriation would do a great disservice not only to farmers but to the entire Nation.●

EL SALVADOR

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1982, President Reagan told Congress that the Salvadoran Government's human rights record entitled it to receive U.S. military aid. This certification to Congress will allow the administration to send \$26 million in military aid to El Salvador

during fiscal 1982. The President, in his letter to Congress, stated that despite some problems which still exist as a result of the civil war, the Duarte government is making a sincere effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights and is achieving substantial control over the armed forces through imposing a code of conduct on the military and outlawing extremist paramilitary groups.

I would like to suggest that these supposed positive actions on the part of the Salvadoran Government are merely for cosmetic purposes. That, in fact, President Reagan—in keeping with the certification provision of the foreign assistance legislation passed last year, should not have certified that the conditions in El Salvador are worthy of additional U.S. military aid. Almost every report coming out of El Salvador seems to indicate that conditions are worsening.

In the January 27 edition of the Washington Post, many of my colleagues will recall the gruesome account of the Salvadoran woman, Amaya, who was the sole survivor of a massacre by Salvadoran soldiers which took place last month. She told of how the soldiers herded people into the village square and separated the men from the women. She saw the men blindfolded and then taken away and shot.

The woman said:

Around noon they began with the women. First they picked out the young girls and took them away to the hills. Then they picked out the old women and took them to Israel Marquez's house on the square. We heard the shots there. Then they started with us in groups. When my turn came and I was being led away to Israel Marquez's house I slipped behind a tree and climbed up. I saw the lieutenant then. He was personally machinegunning people, I heard the soldiers talking * * * An order arrived from a Lt. Caceres to Lt. Ortega to go ahead and kill the children too. A soldier said "Lieutenant somebody here says he won't kill children." "Who's the sonofabitch who said that?" the lieutenant answered. "I am going to kill him." I could hear them shouting from where I was crouching in the tree. I could hear the children crying. I heard my own children. When it was all over late at night the lieutenant ordered the soldiers to put a torch to the corpses. There was a great fire in the night.

Other stories have surfaced that are equally as terrifying. In Amnesty International's 1981 human rights report we are told of an incident in which Salvadoran soldiers gathered children and babies together, threw them into the air and slashed them to death with machetes. The children were then decapitated and their bodies slit into pieces and thrown to the dogs.

A human rights report compiled by the American Civil Liberties Union and Americas Watch Committee informs us that torture—of the most brutal kind—is commonplace in El Salvador. The report goes on to state that

statistics are difficult to compile because there are so few victims who survive to give testimony. However, the bodies that are recovered show signs of uncivilized torture.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear that the conditions in El Salvador do not justify the President's certification. In fact, in light of the recent reports and testimonies of various people who have fled from El Salvador we might ask—how can the President, in good conscience, allow military aid to continue? I would like to suggest that President Reagan heed the words of the great British conservative Edmund Burke who once said, "A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood." By militarily propping up a regime that oppresses its people—we, too, are contributing to that oppression.

There are those in the administration who attempt to justify American involvement in El Salvador as a crusade to prevent that country from falling into the hands of the Communists. I would like to point out that the Reagan administration is advancing the cause of communism while seeking to contain it in El Salvador. I would urge the administration to be more mindful of history. Over 25 years ago, in an attempt to save the Iranian people from the harsh effects of communism, the CIA put the Shah on the throne in Iran. Since that time, the United States propped him up with billions in arms. However, the Shah fell to the challenge of a religious extremist because he had lost the support of his people. People who were tired of going without food, living in poverty and being physically abused and even tortured for the smallest bit of dissent. I need not describe the well-known activities of the SAVAK secret police and the terror they spread amongst the Iranian people. It is important to note that the same people who turned on the Shah seized the U.S. Embassy in Tehran.

In retrospect—one cannot help but feel that it would have made more sense and been more beneficial to the people of Iran and the United States (and to global security) if instead of arms we had sent people who knew how to farm, build homes, build roads, and heal the sick. If we had, perhaps the fate of Iran might have been different.

Unfortunately, it seems we are falling victim to the same type of mentality in our dealings with El Salvador. Rather than trying to win the hearts of the Salvadoran people through food, medical supplies, and development aid—we are, instead, sending sophisticated arms to the present government which has no respect for the most basic civil and human rights of its people. The people of El Salvador are turning on their present government—not out of a lust for Marxist

ideology—but, rather, in hopes of putting food in their children's mouths and shelter over their children's heads. Communism can seem very attractive to an oppressed people—especially if it is the only alternative to sustained oppression.

Mr. Speaker, our policy toward El Salvador has become so distorted and so twisted that I fear, unless immediate action is taken to end military assistance to that country, we will soon find ourselves in an unnecessary war in Central America. There appears to be no end to our involvement. Just yesterday, the administration announced its desire to send an additional \$55 million in military aid to that distraught country. And, in conscience, some final words must be said about our moral obligation to the people of El Salvador. I am appalled by the apparent insensitivity of the present administration toward the atrocities that are now occurring in El Salvador. The fact that the United States is militarily maintaining a regime that is oppressing its people is a betrayal of the very ideals of our Founding Fathers. The basis for the creation of the United States was freedom and self-determination. We are not living up to those high ideals when we, indirectly, contribute to the obstruction of those freedoms for the people of El Salvador.

At this time, I would like to add my name as a cosponsor and ardent supporter of Representative GERRY STUDD's resolution, calling for a suspension of U.S. military aid to El Salvador until the Senate and House have both concluded that the conditions established by law have truly been achieved.

In addition, I would like to submit for the RECORD a very perceptive article published in the Washington Post on February 2, 1982, by the very gifted columnist, Mary McGrory.

The article follows:

KILLINGS, ATROCITIES, AND NOW REAGAN SUGGESTS A GOLD STAR?

To the surprise of no one, Ronald Reagan has certified human rights progress on the part of the government of El Salvador. Given his mind-set about leftist insurgencies, he would nominate it for the Nobel Peace Prize.

His policy toward the murderous junta is as rigid as it is uncoordinated.

Immediately following the award of Reagan's gold star, government troops stormed into a San Salvador slum and murdered 19 people. It was a continuation of their program of winning hearts and minds through massacre.

Millions of Americans watched on their weekend television news shows as bullet-ridden bodies were hauled onto trucks and victims' wives and children, eyes wide with horror, stared into the cameras. We had just been told that the president proposes to subsidize this policy of extermination with an immediate additional \$55 million in aid.

The administration view of the atrocity, which came so embarrassingly on the heels

of official U.S. approval, was carried to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Thomas O. Enders, assistant secretary for inter-American affairs, a suave survivor of another adventure in supporting unpopular government—the Vietnam war. El Salvador in no way resembles that, he said emphatically.

Enders looks the ultimate diplomat, a man of enormous height and distinction. There apparently is nothing he will not say in support of Foggy Bottom fantasy.

Quizzed about other alleged government atrocities, he glided into the absurd. The blame for the mass killings in Morazan must be borne by the leftists. It was not possible to prove or disprove that the government troops had killed hundreds of peasants, he said, but, "the guerrilla forces did nothing to remove them from the path of battle." It says a great deal about our side in El Salvador that we expect its enemies to rescue people from it.

Reagan, in his certification, said the trend in official murder is "downwards." The figures do not support him. According to Reuben Zamora, an exiled leftist leader, quoting the legal aid office of the Catholic diocese of El Salvador, the total of noncombatant deaths went from 8,062 in 1980 to 12,501 in 1981. A drop in the last three months is explained by the fact that thugery has moved out of the cities and into the countryside, where reporting is more difficult.

The United States wants to give the Salvadorans \$55 million to replace helicopters lost in a rebel raid and \$30 million for unspecified purposes, while we press for the political solution through elections in March. Guerrilla leaders reject elections, perhaps because all are on a government proscribed list and would be shot on sight as they approached their local polling place. They favor negotiations, which the United States says are out of the question.

One person in the State Department apparatus apparently did not get the word about the "political" solution. He was none other than our ambassador in El Salvador, Deane Hinton, who gave an interview in which he let the cat out of the bag.

There may be no choice he said, in an unguarded moment, but to go for a military victory.

The idea that we can buy one merely by pouring in more weapons is not compelling. The one way it could be done would be through an increase in U.S. advisers. Getting Congress to vote for more direct military intervention in an election year is not a realistic possibility.

Hinton, when asked if he saw a way out of the war, said, "I don't know."

Enders shook his gray-blond head when confronted with this outbreak of honesty in the ranks.

"It is not my view," he said succinctly. "We are proposing institution-building."

Enders did his most notable "institution-building" as ambassador to Cambodia where, from the embassy, he directed U.S. bombing runs.

Amid the contradictions and confusions, Enders had one card to play—an endorsement of El Salvador. The lone member who does not support the government, Archbishop Rivera y Damas, was among the signatories. That was a coup for the State Department, which has encountered fierce resistance to its course from U.S. bishops. It has had much better luck with the Vatican, which takes a more sympathetic view of the civil war as an East-West showdown in the hemisphere.

Enders did not mention the crude bargain being offered to sweeten the preposterous certification—a promise that the six soldiers accused of the 1980 murder of four U.S. churchwomen would, finally, be brought to trial.

The families of the women, who have been given the runaround at the State Department, are not mollified. They want to send observers. They don't want to now just who pulled the trigger, they want to know who gave the orders.

And Rep. Gerry E. Studds (D-Mass.) and Rep. Michael Barnes (D-Md.) are introducing a resolution to declare the Reagan certification null and void. It would have no binding effect, but many members of Congress blanch at going on the record in favor of financing official terror in a year during which they have to go before the voters.●

HOW CAN ANYBODY SPEND A TRILLION DOLLARS?

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article, entitled "How Can Anybody Spend a Trillion Dollars?" The article was sent to me by my constituent Frederick Rice and it proved thought provoking:

HOW CAN ANYBODY SPEND A TRILLION DOLLARS?

How much is one trillion dollars? That is the new limit our government wishes to put on the national debt. But, have you ever tried to place one trillion in perspective and compare it with something a little more down-to-earth? It's mind-boggling.

Consider just how far a trillion dollars would go these days. Not necessarily in buying power, because the present rate of inflation makes any calculations nearly worthless as soon as they are written down. So, how far will a trillion dollars go—laid end to end?

A single dollar bill is six inches long. Starting on a smaller scale, one million dollar bills would reach about 95 miles if laid end to end. That's about the distance from Santa Ana to San Diego. You won't want the job of laying them end to end, so use a 600-miles-per-hour jet airplane to reel out the string of a million one dollar bills. It'll take you about nine and one-half minutes.

Now let's try a billion dollar bills. The end-to-end length would be about 95,000 miles—about four times around the world at the equator! The jet plane ride would take six days and 14 hours.

Ready to place one trillion one dollar bills end to end? That's one thousand billion, or one million million, dollar bills. Now you've really got your work cut out for you. You're going to travel 95 million miles! Remember that it's only 93 million miles from the Earth to the nearest star—our Sun. And, assuming the jet airplane can carry one trillion dollars, the trip will take 18 years non-stop.

As you can see, one trillion dollars is difficult to comprehend. The point of all this: How can anybody possibly spend that much money?●

THE CARE FOR KEEPING U.S. AID TO COLLEGES

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, as a people and a nation, we have always cherished the availability of an education as central to our hopes for prosperity. Now, for the first time in our country's history, we have an administration which is seeking to reverse our long held commitment to obtaining an education. Through massive budget cuts in our financial aid programs, President Reagan is taking an action that will not only cost this country billions of dollars through the loss of future technological skills, but is saying that in our democracy, education is not for everyone who is qualified, but only for those who can afford it.

With the debate now beginning in Congress on the proposed next round of cuts in education, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the perspective of one of our Nation's premier educators, Michael I. Sovern, the president of Columbia University, published in the February 7 New York Times Magazine. I urge all my colleagues to give this article serious consideration.

THE CASE FOR KEEPING U.S. AID TO COLLEGES

(By Michael I. Sovern)

"If you think education is expensive," goes an old college fund-raising maxim, "try ignorance." The warning is timely.

At a time when Government should be making major new investments in campus research, vital to raising national productivity, the Reagan Administration has embarked on a program of "economies" that will drastically curtail research efforts in the nation's universities, turn many of the best minds of a generation away from careers in education and research, and close the door to first-rate young people who cannot pay today's tuitions.

Obviously, those assigning us the loser's role in the international technology competition have not intended these consequences. Commenting on the entire Federal budget, David Stockman himself conceded that "we didn't think it all the way through."

It is, however, not too late to think it all the way through and reverse the damaging cuts in student aid as well as cuts in funding of new scientific equipment and in university research budgets—measures that would actually result in "savings" of only a fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

The issue is not whether the Federal Government as a whole is spending too much or too little, nor whether the supply-siders, Keynesians or monetarists, have the best of the argument. Whatever the economic faith of our elected officials, increased support for education and research must be given a high priority.

The predominance of American professors among Nobel Prize winners dramatically

demonstrates the importance of our campuses in producing men and women who gave this nation the lead it once enjoyed in science and technology. But Nobel Prizes celebrate the accomplishments of yesterday, not tomorrow.

Today, at independent universities that trained most of the country's scientists and produced the lion's share of major research advances, world-renowned pioneers are working in physical facilities that are woefully out of date. Although China's scientific development fell far behind us during the Cultural Revolution, a recent group of Chinese visitors were astonished at the antiquated scientific equipment they saw on a tour of a leading Middle Western university.

Had they traveled more widely, they would have realized that this was the norm and not the exception. Not only has laboratory equipment been refined at a dizzying pace, but costs have skyrocketed as well. A recent study by the Association of American Universities found that a \$750 million investment in scientific equipment and facilities is needed over the next three years simply to sustain current activities at only 15 of the nation's research universities.

It would be hyperbolic to say that we are embarking on our own Cultural Revolution. But one can imagine, without exaggeration, a news story of Jan. 20, 1989, datelined Washington, that reads: "In her inaugural address, the President called for a multibillion-dollar crash program of Federal and private investment in America's university research base. She asserted that radical action is critical to meet the problems posed by the greatest shortage of scientists and scholars in our history. Without it, she said, we have no hope of regaining our position as tenth most productive nation in the world."

Such a news story would not be farfetched because the per capita gross national product of the United States has slipped to tenth place in the world. Our foreign trade pattern resembles that of an underdeveloped country: We export raw materials in abundance and import more manufactured goods than we sell abroad. All this cannot be isolated from the fact that over the past 15 years, Japan and West Germany have doubled their output of scientists and engineers.

Tolerance of this erosion of our ability to compete in the world runs counter both to the Reagan agenda and to a long and wise tradition. Since World War II, the Government has pursued a bipartisan policy rooted in the recognition that the nation's well-being depends on a national commitment to the quality of its universities. Federal support produced the rapid growth of graduate schools and the consequent surge to international pre-eminence of American university research. The Federal Government has recognized that scientific and technological competitions with other nations are won or lost on American campuses.

Major research universities cannot but applaud the Reagan Administration's goals of controlling inflation and promoting a sound and stable economy, but these goals are not served by cutbacks in Federal assistance to higher education. When a high-technology company is in danger of losing out to the competition, it invests more in research and development, not less. In the world economy, the United States competes for scientific leadership not only with Japan but with much of Western Europe. If this country is to meet that competition, have a sound economy and bring inflation under control,

it must invest more in research and development. Past investment in American universities has been repaid many times over by massive contributions to the national strength. If there is a time to increase that investment, this is it.

When Ronald Reagan took office, there was no Federal program to deal with the decaying physical plant of the nation's universities. There was the beginning of a response to the problem of outdated equipment, but this was killed by the Office of Management and Budget. What all universities had was a respectable program for making the most of their "human capital." "Human capital," the economist Eli Ginzberg pointed out, "defined as the 'skill, dexterity and knowledge' of the population, has become the critical input that determines the rate of growth of the economy. . . ." This perspective underlies the Federal Government's provision since 1965 of nearly \$20 billion in loan guarantees and interest subsidies for college and university students plus billions more in direct financial aid to students most in need. Session after session of Congress concluded that these funds would be a fruitful investment in the nation's future.

The Reagan Administration, however, is pressing a massive assault on virtually every aspect of the Federal student aid program. It did put an end to such questionable programs as subsidized loans to families that did not need them. But by proposing huge additional cuts in student aid, the Administration has shown little understanding of the critical importance of such aid to the national interest. Without a strong Federal role in assisting promising students to further their studies, the supply of students will diminish in quantity and quality. In fact, many graduate schools are facing a diminishing pool of qualified applicants.

Ironically, success in the drive against student aid would mean not only a dismantling of much of the nation's research base, but a large increase in costs to the taxpayer as well.

To understand that paradox, one must understand the financing of a college education. It actually costs about \$8,000 per student for a college to run a high-quality undergraduate program. That does not include books, room, board and other living costs.

Suppose a promising Cincinnati high school senior—call him Alex Hamilton—wants to attend an Ivy League university. The Hamilton family's income is about the national median of \$21,000. Alex's younger sister is also a good student.

Many students like Alex are enrolled in independent colleges and universities today. How? First, they are often not charged what it actually costs to educate them. Endowment income and contributions meet some expenses that would otherwise be passed along as part of the tuition fee. Second, needy students can receive an additional subsidy in the form of a scholarship, for which Alex Hamilton would qualify at many schools. Third, Alex may borrow \$2,500 from a bank at 9 percent interest under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. Fourth, he would be eligible for a Federal Pell Grant of about \$800. He and his parents would make up the rest—from any savings they might have and from his summer and after-school jobs.

Thus, we have a package of support provided by the college, Alex, his parents, and the Federal Government. Like millions of Americans before him—including Ronald Reagan and me—Alex is working his way

through college. But times have changed: No student can earn what it costs to attend an independent college today. To ask that every student contribute something before receiving help is fair. To withhold help from those who have done all that can be expected of them is cruel and ultimately wasteful.

How much is the Federal Government actually contributing to the cost of Alex's higher education? Since he pays no interest on his loan until after graduation, the Federal share includes the interest on that \$2,500 loan—say \$375 per year (at 15 percent interest). That plus his Pell Grant of \$800 totals \$1,175 for his freshman year. The taxpayer's dollar is matched about 6 to 1 by private resources, and Alex is free to choose a college based on his ability. (As he moves to his senior year and borrows more, the Federal interest cost will rise accordingly, but it will never be more than a small fraction of his total costs.)

What has the Reagan Administration proposed? First, shrink the Pell Grant program. This would eliminate Alex Hamilton's eligibility. Subtract \$800. Second, abolish the in-school interest subsidy. Subtract the remaining \$375. There would be an apparent saving to the taxpayer of \$1,175.

But there is no such saving. It still costs \$8,000 to educate Alex Hamilton. Without the option of going to a private college or university—where the cost of that education is largely absorbed by private resources—students like Alex will most likely go to a public institution close to home. The tuition at a publicly supported institution is about \$1,500; the remaining \$6,500 comes from public funds. Thus, by increasing the number of students at public universities, the Reagan Administration will actually be saddling state taxpayers with an increased cost of \$6,500 in order to save \$1,175.

Furthermore, the Reagan Administration's policy toward higher education will affect a staggeringly large number of students: Most of this country's 12 million college and university students come from families with incomes of less than \$30,000; the families of many earn less than \$20,000.

A fundamental strength of the American system of higher education is diversity. It would be folly to upset the balance of public and private education, to limit individual choice, to segregate rich students in private universities and the poor and middle class in public ones. Yet these are the effects of the Reagan Administration's financial aid policy.

What of the effect of the Administration's proposals on graduate schools—the source of tomorrow's researchers, scholars and teachers?

If Alex Hamilton were to spend four years at an independent college, by the time he graduated he would owe \$10,000—plus, under the Administration's plan, annual interest costs. Lending institutions have indicated they will not take on the burden of collecting interest from students on a periodic basis. In response, the Administration has recommended compounding the interest so Alex will owe not \$10,000 on graduation, but \$12,000 or more.

At that point he must decide whether to go on for a Ph.D. or try a professional school. As a graduate student he is now entitled to borrow \$5,000 a year. If Alex chooses the Ph.D. route, the Administration's proposal would bring his cumulative debt after his first year to approximately \$19,000. After his second year, that debt will be approaching \$26,000. And he still has at least three more years before he can reasonably

hope to get an assistant professorship—at a salary of less than \$20,000 a year. The prospect is forbidding even with the in-school interest subsidy.

The nation's universities are producing lawyers and business-school graduates at an unprecedented rate and scientists and scholars in diminishing numbers. Traditionally, a large proportion of graduate students in the humanities have set their sights on college teaching. But with little hope of immediate employment during the current tenure bulge, many of the best scholars are switching to professional schools. In an exhaustive and disturbing study of the perils facing American graduate schools, William G. Bowen, president of Princeton University, found that in 1980 only 34 percent of all *summa* graduates at Harvard-Radcliffe planned immediate graduate study in the arts and sciences—compared with more than 75 percent in the mid-1960's. And who will be there to teach the next generation of scientists? Between 1970 and 1980, the number of Ph.D.'s in physics graduating from American universities dropped by almost half—from 1,740 to 985.

If the budget cutters have their way, tomorrow's little band of Ph.D.'s will consist of the scions of the wealthy, another handful that the best-endowed universities can afford to support, and a larger number supported by taxpayers at public colleges and universities. Though our graduate schools have had a glorious past—leading the nation in a century of unparalleled advances in research—whether they have a future depends upon the continued resistance of Congress to an unbelievably shortsighted proposal.

I believe deeply in the unquantifiable values of a university. Great universities aspire to transmit to their students the heritage of civilization; to unlock the treasures of the past; to bring fresh vision and new discipline to the growing fund of human knowledge; to enliven curiosity; to cherish the freedom to explore and express; to encourage joy in the presence of beauty and appreciation in the presence of wisdom; to discover, in the words of William Saroyan, "that which shines and is beyond corruption." It is not simply for technology that we need to know more, Lewis Thomas observes, "but for the hope of wisdom which our kind of culture must acquire for its survival."

A society that undervalues such aspirations does so at its peril. But even if one believes that a democratic society has no stake transcending economics and defense in the education of its citizens, one has to conclude that the Administration's policy toward higher education runs counter to the goals it has set for itself.

Anyone who balances the cost of fundamental laboratory research—which provides the base for such practical discoveries as antibiotics—against the soaring cost of medical care will find that, dollar for dollar, biomedical research is far and away the best buy in town. The sad irony is that today, with the explosive productivity of the "new biology," the opportunities for helping patients in the nation's hospitals are greater than ever before. Yet in 1981 the Reagan Administration insisted on cutting funding of basic biomedical research in our universities.

As to the Administration's commitment to enhance our national security, I would have thought it obvious that today's defense rests fundamentally on yesterday's basic science. The laser, for example, though happily of

great use to medicine, communications, chemistry and physics, among others, is also at the heart of a number of weapons systems. Every Administration for the past 40 years has recognized the fundamental importance of basic science to the defense effort.

And what of the humanists and social scientists studying the cultures, politics and economics of our allies and adversaries? How can this country conduct an informed foreign policy without a flow of experts on the various areas of the world? We have only a dribble and it is in danger of evaporating further still.

The Department of Defense (D.O.D.) is trying to help. In a memo to Pentagon officials, Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger has warned: "The national base of basic research is inadequate to meet future D.O.D. needs and substantial sustained real growth in defense research is needed to restore this base." Although the Pentagon estimates that it will increase spending for basic research at universities by some \$60 million during the current fiscal year, this comes nowhere near compensating for the hundreds of millions of basic research dollars cut from other programs. And, unlike the beleaguered National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health, which have funded broad areas of fundamental research, the Pentagon's concept of "basic" research, in line with legal, fiscal and political constraints, must be directed toward projects of identifiable value to the military.

If the American university research base is not to be saved by the Pentagon, what about corporate philanthropy? "The level of industrial support for university research may triple in the 1980's," said Dr. Edward E. David Jr., president of the Exxon Research and Engineering Company, "but that would not equal the proposed cuts in the Federal budget in only one year." Last fall, the Exxon Education Foundation, aware that in recent years doctoral candidacies in engineering have declined by one-third, announced a program sensitive to the impending shortage of faculty members (between 10 and 15 percent of engineering faculty positions across the nation are currently unfilled). The foundation divided \$15 million for graduate fellowships and junior faculty salary support among 66 engineering schools, a boost for which all 66 of us are grateful. Neither Exxon nor its beneficiaries claim these new, thinly spread grants are more than a small step in the long journey toward an answer to the question: Who will be left to teach the next generation of engineers?

Increases in corporate contributions to higher education in recent years are heartening. "Total corporate aid to higher education has risen to the billion-dollar-per-year range," observed Edward G. Jefferson, chairman of Du Pont and one of the leaders in corporate support for higher education. Yet, he added, "it is unlikely that corporate aid can be expected to offset reductions in Government funding."

The proposition that Federal cuts create incentives for private gifts is dangerously deceptive. In fact, Federal dollars on campus are frequently necessary to generate private dollars—both from increased numbers of students and from private philanthropy. When Federal aid was climbing, so was the quality of graduate students attracted to well-financed research projects and prominent professors whose distinction in teaching was matched by excellence in

grant-supported research. As Federal assistance declines, the quality of research deteriorates, new funds dry up, old sources of support wither.

President Reagan's science adviser, George Keyworth, agrees that "the heaviest responsibility for basic research naturally falls on the Government. This is especially true where long-term, high-risk research is involved. . . ." Those are reassuring words, but the numbers are less cheering. The President's latest budget requests call for substantial cuts in the research and development funds of most Federal agencies and departments.

Overall, according to Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences, the latest cuts proposed by the President would take away another \$600 million from the \$5.5 billion Federal budget for basic research. The resistance of Congress has so far spared the National Science Foundation's budget for the physical sciences, mathematics and engineering—at least for the moment they are scheduled to receive nominal increases—but funding for science education was cut by more than two-thirds.

Programs for basic research have always been easy to cut. They do not pack the political punch of urgency and quick results. From 1968 to 1980, according to Richard Atkinson, Chancellor of the University of California at San Diego and former director of the National Science Foundation, basic research as a fraction of the Federal budget declined by 27 percent and as a fraction of the gross national product by 16 percent.

The abruptness of many Federal cuts aggravates the problem. Following a meeting in October with Administration officials in Washington, nearly 100 distinguished scientists issued this statement: "Instability and abrupt changes in funding have severe effects: Research teams are broken up; investments in experiments involving large facilities . . . are poorly used. The continued flow of new researchers into our industrial and university laboratories is best maintained by their stable and continued participation in university-based graduate research."

"Basic science is a long-term investment, and depends on government support," stated the scientists. "Support of scientific research is a public expenditure from which all sectors of society benefit. There are no significant sources of support for such a collective benefit which can replace the Federal Government."

Without a major increase in Federal support for research projects and assistance to students, there will almost certainly be a further weakening of this nation, as countries with the sense to anticipate the future assume the lead. "The strength of the nation's research and development comes back to the strength of our top universities," acknowledged Dr. Keyworth. "We must restore strength to them."

As the President's science adviser, Dr. Keyworth reflects the Administration's views on the importance of the nation's leading universities. At the same time, the President has a profound commitment to preserving the vitality of the private sector. In his commencement address at Notre Dame last year, he said: "If ever the great independent colleges and universities are replaced by tax-supported institutions, the struggle to preserve academic freedom will have been lost."

But if these convictions are not impressed on the budget makers who have been hacking away at higher education, this Administration is in danger of going down in history

as the great ravager of our independent colleges and universities.

The President can still lead us away from that destructive fate. Congress, in resisting major student aid and research cuts, has shown that it will follow if the Administration will lead in building on what we have.

Not only should the Administration renew the research capability of the nation's universities by restoring the cuts in basic research support, it should upgrade scientific equipment in our deteriorating university laboratories and establish a national construction fund to help rebuild university research facilities.

In addition to preserving the in-school interest subsidy, the Reagan Administration should:

Continue to make loans available to every student who shows genuine need. After all, these loans are made by private institutions, not the Government, and repayment is the obligation of the student. Besides, declining interest rates will cut much more of this program's costs than any of the pending proposals for change.

Restore the cuts in the Pell Grant and related Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants programs. During the past academic year, Pell Grants closed the gap for 2.7 million students. This year the gap is wider, with \$300 million already slashed from the program.

Increase support for Work-Study, the program that makes it possible for students to find jobs in a tight economy so that they can work their way through college.

Carry out the program of merit graduate fellowships that became law as the Education Amendments of 1980 but that has yet to receive an appropriation.

These measures can be funded through savings from cuts that should not be reversed—\$2 billion through the elimination of Social Security's financial aid feature and billions more from changes in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program already enacted.

Should more than those savings be invested in higher education and research? All I ask is that our elected representatives look at the way our money has been used, and with what results, from the G.I. Bill of Rights to the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health to the Pell Grant. Is there a more productive and broadly beneficial investment in human resources and the nation's future than a strong Federal commitment to the American university? ●

THE VOLUNTEER DEVELOPMENT CORPS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fine work being accomplished by the Volunteer Development Corps. This organization was created in 1970 to provide short-term, volunteer, technical help to cooperatives in developing countries. It has been doing an excellent job ever since.

In 1980 alone, 33 VDC volunteers completed 31 projects in 20 developing

countries—7 in Africa, 5 in Asia and the Pacific, 15 in Latin America, and 4 in Jamaica. Twenty-two of these projects involved cooperatives marketing farmers' products, distributing farm supplies, and providing farm credit. Three involved cooperatives providing thrift and credit services, and others helped cooperatives providing insurance services and handling consumer goods.

Glenn Heitz is an outstanding example of the volunteers which VDC attracts. Mr. Heitz has been President of the Federal Land Bank of St. Louis, Mo. since 1970 and, to put it briefly, knows everything there is to know about cooperative farm credit systems in the United States. Drawing upon his expertise and experience, Glenn went to Brazil this past fall as a VDC volunteer to meet with top Brazilian agricultural and financial leaders on setting up a farm credit cooperative system in that country. The lack of a cooperative credit system for Brazilian farmers has seriously inhibited their ability to increase production. Without recommending that Brazil adopt the U.S. system, which has worked well for our farmers but which may not be transferrable to an advanced developing country, we were able to convey to the Brazilian leaders the basic principles of farm credit systems in the United States and relate problems and possibilities which Brazilian authorities might want to consider in setting up their own systems.

There was agreement at the end of the meetings that, because of the volunteer services of Glenn Heitz, Brazil was able to avoid errors in establishing cooperative credit for the farmers. A followup visit of the Brazilians involved to St. Louis later this year is planned to permit ideas to be exchanged once again and the process furthered.

I would like to congratulate the Volunteer Development Corps, whose current budget of over \$600,000 a year is funded mostly by the Agency for International Development, for their work and for sending Glenn Heitz to Brazil. And I would like to express my appreciation to Glenn for his outstanding contribution to agricultural development within the United States and now abroad. It is the efforts of individuals such as this man which help advance international peace and stability. ●

CLEVELAND BELLOW

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, Webster defines art as "the conscious use of skill and creative imagination espe-

cially in the production of aesthetic objects."

Too often, the contribution of art and the work of our Nation's artists go without recognition. We must be thoughtful and maintain an historic record of artistic contributions. I rise in recognition of a nationally acclaimed artist, graphic designer, and educator, Mr. Cleveland Bellow.

Mr. Bellow is the recipient of a B.F.A. in graphic design and an M.A. in art from the College of Arts & Crafts in Oakland, Calif. He has been a Rockefeller fellow in museum education, interning at the Fine Arts Museum in San Francisco and a National Endowment of the Arts fellow, 1979-80.

Mr. Bellow's exhibits speak for themselves. They include: The Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery; Studio Museum, New York; Museum of the National Center for Afro-American Artists, Boston, Mass.; 2d World Festival of Black and African Arts and Culture, Lagos, Nigeria; San Francisco Art Festival; Society's Child Gallery, Seattle, Wash.; Whitney Museum of Art, New York; Jackson, Mississippi Municipal Art Gallery; California State Fair and the Oakland, California Museum.

Mr. Bellow has numerous publications and has been active in civic affairs. He is the newly-elected chairman of the Alameda County Arts Commission in California and has earned my respect as a conscientious and creative professional worthy of this recognition. ●

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISSING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the role of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia. The league, under the direction of Col. Earl P. Hopper and Ms. Ann Mills Griffiths has been instrumental in providing public awareness and support that is imperative in working to obtain an honorable resolution for our heroic men still left in Indochina 9 years after the signing of the Paris peace accords.

Last week, on January 26, 1982, the league sponsored a day-long seminar including participants from veterans groups, Veterans' Administration coordinators, and officials of the intelligence community. This meeting was conducive to all representatives in attendance by providing updated infor-

mation of current U.S. Government policy in this area.

The league has shown considerable interest in the efforts of the House Task Force on American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, of which I am chairman. I recently received a letter indicating their anticipation that the task force will pursue every avenue in Congress to advance progress in acquiring a final and acceptable resolution to this nightmare that has plagued not only the POW's and MIA's but also the American people for over 18 years.

The letter from Colonel Hopper follows:

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF
AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISS-
ING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA,
Washington, D.C.

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN,
Chairman, Task Force on American Prison-
ers and Missing in Southeast Asia,
Cannon House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Task Force on American POW/MIAs in Southeast Asia has primary Congressional responsibility for ensuring that various U.S. government agencies are exerting maximum effort to resolve the question of whether Americans are still held prisoner in Indochina and developing policies to utilize such data.

Over two years has passed since then Director of DIA, LTG Eugene Tighe, USAF, testified before Congress that high priority would be assigned to POW/MIA intelligence collection. Since that time, and as evidenced by more recent testimony, the situation has evolved to the point where General Tighe last testified that in his professional judgement, Americans are currently held captive in Indochina.

The League's concern is to determine a means for getting past "increasingly convincing evidence" that POWs are still held to "conclusive proof" of the fact. We have repeatedly been assured that high priority is currently being assigned, that all U.S. intelligence collection disciplines are being utilized and that the U.S. government has the necessary commitment to ensure resolution of the issue. Nevertheless, there seems to be a roadblock.

Two years is more than adequate time to confirm or deny reports and other intelligence regarding the existence of live POWs—in fact it is too long. The most respected and highest officials within U.S. intelligence have previously stated that American POWs were left behind in 1973. In view of the stature of the witnesses appearing at this hearing, I believe it appropriate to obtain their responses to these requirements.

We look to the Congress, specifically the Task Force, to delve into this problem, seeking a means to overcome whatever obstacles exist. Adequate resources are said to be available to determine the validity of over 370 first-hand live sighting reports. The question is not one of available resources but rather of willingness on the part of the current Administration. Strategic factors are now playing a greater role and what should be considered a humanitarian issue is now extremely political, not by the League's choice nor by the government's, but by political realities in Indochina.

We strongly encourage you and the members of the Task Force to critically investi-

gate what is currently being done and what additionally needs to be undertaken to ensure that specific actions are now taken to end years of uncertainty surrounding the POW/MIA issue.

If enough time passes, and it has already been nine years since the termination of official U.S. involvement, there will no longer be a problem of Americans still held captive—all will have died, thinking that their own government did not care to exert sufficient effort to gain their freedom.

We in the League urge you to fulfill your expressed commitment to the POW/MIAs and their families.

Sincerely,

EARL P. HOPPER, Sr.,
Chairman of the Board.●

APPOINTMENT OF MS. JO-ANN GASPER

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I, and several of my fellow members in the Congresswoman's Caucus have written a letter to Secretary Schweiker to express our displeasure at the appointment of Ms. Jo-Ann Gasper to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Social Services Policy at the Department of Health and Human Services.

As my colleagues can see from the letter, which I submit for the RECORD, Ms. Gaspar has demonstrated an incredible ignorance of, and lack of sensitivity to the serious problem of family violence.

Secretary Schweiker has made one more appointment from a pool of extremists who are bent on reversing the progress we have made in this country toward dealing with the concerns of the American family. Ms Gaspar has managed to minimize and trivialize family violence at a time when it is increasing. The FBI estimates that an American woman is abused every 18 seconds. This adds up to nearly 5,000 women abused each day. One-eighth of all murders in the United States are the result of spouses killing their spouses.

I have introduced legislation (H.R. 1651) which would begin a coordinated Federal response to this insidious problem, and provide the groundwork for State, local, and private resources to develop the capacity to deal, in a positive and safe manner with victims of domestic violence.

I urge my colleagues to express to Mr. Schweiker their displeasure with this shortsighted appointment, and to give this administration a message that we will not tolerate a return to the days when violence was a "private affair."●

PARRIS LAUDS POLL ON DULLES

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention an article recently published in the Journal newspapers of northern Virginia concerning the issue of whether to use Dulles International Airport or National Airport.

As reported by the Journal, "A whopping 69 percent of northern Virginia residents would prefer to use Dulles International Airport rather than close-in National Airport, if the same flights were available at each facility."

Since most airlines claim that by changing flights from National Airport to Dulles would displease customers, I find the Journal report extraordinarily enlightening and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

[From the Fairfax Journal, Feb. 8, 1982]

NORTHERN VIRGINIANS FAVOR DULLES, 2 to 1
(By Tom Wurliu)

A whopping 69 percent of Northern Virginia residents would prefer to use Dulles International Airport rather than close-in National Airport, if the same flights were available at each facility.

That's the startling result of a poll by telephone completed late last week.

The Journal phoned 350 residents of Fairfax and Arlington counties, Alexandria, Falls Church, Fairfax City, Vienna, Burke, Herndon, Reston, Clifton and Fort Belvoir.

Major airlines have long maintained they would gladly shift flights from seriously over-crowded National if the public would use Dulles. In the past, they maintain, few travelers wanted to make the trip to the Fairfax County terminal.

The results of *The Journal* poll appear to cast doubt on that conclusion—at least insofar as it concerns the million people living in Northern Virginia.

Those called were asked:

If it were possible to take the same flights from both Dulles and National airports, which terminal would you use?

POLL RESULTS

	Airport	Total	percent
Dulles.....		241	69
National.....		109	31

The most surprising result of *The Journal* poll was the fact that citizens from nearly all parts of the Northern Virginia area said they would be willing to use Dulles if more flights were available there.

It was expected that respondents in western and northern Fairfax County would vote for Dulles, but so did people living in Falls Church and Arlington.

In only two areas, Alexandria and Mount Vernon-Lee, did the poll show a definite preference for National.

The polling was completed in one evening, with respondents asked which airport they

would use if flight availability were the same.

They also were asked where they lived.

The random sampling was sufficient to insure accuracy within a five percent plus or minus range.

Carrington Williams, chairman of the Dulles Policy Task Force, termed the poll results "of great interest."

The information will be passed on to airlines on Feb. 16, Williams said, when representatives of the commercial carriers meet to consider possible shifts of business from National to Dulles.

That meeting, sponsored by the Department of Transportation, will include officials from various area groups fighting to boost flights at Dulles.

Even if the airlines are able to work out a plan to shift some traffic to Dulles, they still must obtain the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The CAB has approved the Feb. 16 session. ●

EMELYN K. JEWETT:

"HUMANITARIAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1982, Emelyn Jewett will be honored as the "Humanitarian of the Year" by the Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Alameda County.

Mrs. Jewett has had and certainly continues to have a full and rewarding life of community and civil activities. She is presently treasurer of the Oakland Economic Development Council; director of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce—the first woman elected to that position; a member of the board of trustees of the Peralta Hospital; community adviser of the Junior League of Oakland/Easy Bay; president and director of the Oakland City Center Hotel Co., Inc.; director of the Marcus Foster Education Institute; director of the Oakland Convention and Visitors Bureau; and trustee of the East Oakland Youth Development Center Foundation. Previously she has served as trustee of the University of California Alumnae Foundation, trustee of the John F. Kennedy University, and trustee of the Oakland Zoological Society.

This, however, does not include her strictly volunteer experiences. She has been a member of the Junior League of Oakland/Easy Bay since 1950 while she served as president and treasurer and also chairman of the Junior League Shop. She has also served as director of the Oakland Museum Association and chairman of their White Elephant Sale; on the board of directors of the Easter Seal Society from 1960 to 1962; and on the board of regents of Holy Names College.

Emelyn Jewett is the daughter of the late William F. Knowland, editor

and publisher of the Oakland Tribune, and Helen Herrick Knowland. She attended the University of California, at Berkeley, majoring in economics and political science. As well as being a wife and mother for over 30 years, she became a member of the board of the Tribune Publishing Co. in 1950 before becoming president and chairman of the board from March 1974 to 1977 when the company was sold. Since 1977 she has been senior vice president of the Oakland Tribune, Inc., with primary responsibility in community relations emphasizing Oakland's economic development. During this time she has also been a director of the Clorex Co., the Kaiser Cement Co., and EUBCO, Inc.

I congratulate Emelyn Jewett as she receives this award. ●

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL TEXTILE CAUCUS QUARTERLY STATEMENT OF EXPENSES AND FUND BALANCE

HON. KEN HOLLAND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the chairman, vice chairman and secretary/treasurer of the Congressional Textile Caucus have approved the quarterly financial statement for the quarter ending December 31, 1981. I am herewith submitting the statement for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may review it.

The statement follows:

CONGRESSIONAL TEXTILE CAUCUS

Financial report of the congressional textile caucus quarterly report of expenses and fund balance

(For the period ending Dec. 31, 1981)

Expenditures:

Telephone.....	\$287.29
Office supplies.....	54.93
Typewriter.....	368.00
Copy machine.....	87.00
Postage.....	43.60
Subscriptions.....	172.70
Office equipment.....	243.75
Miscellaneous.....	520.00

Total expenditures..... 1,777.27

Fund balance:

Fund balance on Sept. 30, 1981.....	12,962.39
Deposited this quarter.....	500.00
Interest on account.....	841.92

Total..... 14,115.68

Less expenditures..... 1,777.27

Balance—Dec. 31, 1981..... 12,527.04 ●

DR. JOHN B. COLEMAN—FRIEND TO EDUCATION

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, education has done a lot for a lot of Americans. For my friend and constituent, Dr. John B. Coleman, the power of knowledge and education has propelled him through a medical degree and successful ventures in the business world. It helped him to overcome the prejudice that surrounded him as a black man in the white-dominated community where he was raised and the prejudice that permeated the walls of the medical schools to which he first applied.

Dr. Coleman never forgot the leg up that his education gave him. It would be an easy thing to do—a responsibility that so many others shirk. But Dr. Coleman is not like so many others. In addition to making his education work for himself he has put it to work for others. He is a regent on the board of Texas A&M University systems and a former regent of Texas Southern University. He is also chairman of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) in Houston, a member of the President's Council of the UNCF and a member of the board of Governor's Office of Education Resources. These kinds of donations of time and effort prompted the Fisk University Alumni to host a banquet last May in honor of Dr. Coleman. Characteristically, the proceeds from the event went to UNCF.

Yet I know Dr. Coleman as more than an education activist. He is a friend and a trusted adviser. I think of his stability, perseverance and quiet dignity—qualities he subtly uses to exercise his influence toward the betterment of his community.

It is for all those reasons that I recommend to you the following article on Dr. Coleman from the Houston Chronicle's Texas Magazine:

DR. JOHN B. COLEMAN—HE PRESCRIBES EDUCATION AS A CURE FOR MANY OF SOCIETY'S ILLS

(By Stan Redding)

Looking north from his offices on Alameda, the view is dominated by Houston's downtown skyline, constantly changing as new skyscrapers seek the clouds and obscure the city's older buildings.

There is a symbolism in the shifting skyline for John B. Coleman, doctor of medicine. Some of the hands which drew the plans for the lofty edifices were black, like his. Some of the engineers who are taking the great towers skyward are black, like him.

"You know, Prairie View A&M graduates more black engineers than any other school in this country," mused Dr. Coleman. "Yet, when I came out of high school, I didn't

know there were different kinds of engineers. I thought an engineer ran the train."

Coleman, if he is a black militant, is a quiet one, given to positive action rather than impassioned rhetoric. Black, unless put into focus with a particular project, is no longer a color that dominates his life. When he thinks black, Coleman thinks of it in terms of education.

And when one of the thousands across the nation who know him think of Coleman, it is usually in terms of education. If John Coleman, physician, could write a prescription for many of the world's ills, a pharmacist would fill it with education.

For in many ways, Coleman is as much an educator as he is a doctor of medicine. He is a regent on the board of Texas A&M University Systems—which includes Prairie View, Tarleton State College, the Moody College of Marine Sciences and Texas A&M at Texarkana—and Huston-Tillotson College in Austin. He is a former regent of Texas Southern University here, chairman of the United Negro College Fund here, a member of the President's Council of the UNCF, a member of the board of the Governor's Office of Education Resources and is deeply involved in the affairs of the Houston Independent School District and a dozen other colleges and secondary schools.

"I don't think education is the answer to all problems, of course, but it certainly helps," said Coleman. "There are, for instance, fewer criminals among educated groups than there are among uneducated groups."

He suggests that petty crime is rooted mainly in the uneducated segments of society. "It has gotten to be a way of life with some people, who are underpaid and don't have adequate resources to take care of their families, to engage in petty criminal activities," said Coleman. "It may be just taking a ham from the kitchen where they work, or cheating on their income tax or whatever, but they feel they need extra money, and such crimes are going to increase unless stopgap measures are found."

Coleman is handsome and articulate, and today he's a man on top of the mountain. His spacious offices reflect his success as an obstetrician and gynecologist, and the graceful building containing the offices reflects his business acumen. He is the majority owner of the building. He is also the owner of Radio Station KCOH, Cullen Women's Center and various other non-medical enterprises. He is a member of 24 city, county, state and national boards, most of them dealing with education or medicine, and the professional and civic honors and awards bestowed on him by community, state and nation are too numerous to cite.

Coleman's Algerian success story epitomizes the theme song of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, *We Shall Overcome*. For if his branches now spread wide in the sun, his roots are in the dark soil of the ghetto. Beneath the polished mien, John Coleman is a scarred veteran of racial wars, a victim of prejudices that laws and changing mores have yet to erase entirely and probably won't.

He talks easily, and without rancor or bitterness, of his childhood in a society where blacks were segregated and of his struggles to succeed in a field which blacks were discouraged from entering. There is no malice in the man. In panning the streams of the past, Coleman always manages to find a nugget of good.

He took his bachelor of science from Fisk University in Nashville and his M.D. degree

from the Howard University School of Medicine in Washington, D.C.

He chose medicine as a career while still a child, after meeting one of Houston's few black physicians. In the 1940's there were only 10 black doctors in the city, all serving the black community. "Doctors were our greatest role models in those days," Coleman recalled. "Of course, we didn't have too many professional opportunities other than being a teacher, preacher or a doctor. There were a few black lawyers, but I don't know how successful they were. However, I never considered anything but medicine. When I was a little kid, my mother would buy me toy medical kits, and they were my favorite toys."

He is the middle child of the eight children of W. S. and Clara Coleman. Coleman was a delivery-truck driver and part-time real estate salesman. Mrs. Coleman was a hairdresser. Although neither had graduated from high school, they were determined that all eight of their children would have college educations, and they did.

"My father died when I was 16," Coleman said. "But my mother carried on. She still lives in the same house on McGowan where I was born and reared."

As a boy, Coleman worked as a porter and Chronicle carrier. He remembers the fears a black child had growing up in a white-dominated, prejudiced community. "As a black child growing up in Houston, you were afraid of anyone who had authority, even to the extent that when a policeman came into your neighborhood, you'd run. We would run even if we were just playing an innocent game of baseball, because in those days the police would whip you and harass you even when you weren't doing anything wrong. Of course, we were taught to respect the police, never to talk back to them and never to be uppity. That's the way we survived. I grew up under that kind of prejudice and fear, and I guess it held me in pretty good stead, for a number of people I knew then didn't live at all. They were killed. Others were put in jail for things they didn't do."

A sign of change: in 1978 Coleman won the Texas Peace Officers Association Award for his support of police community programs.

He graduated from Jack Yates High School as an honor student, but when he started looking for a medical college, he again encountered the barriers of prejudice. "I had the aspirations of going to Baylor or the University of Texas," Coleman said. "But those schools weren't admitting black medical students. I would have much preferred to have gone to UT or Baylor, because I would have spent much less time away from home and my family, it would have cost me less, and it would have been easier for me to acquaint myself with the environment in which I was going to practice."

"But I couldn't get a medical education in Texas, simply because there were no provisions for blacks. I had to travel all the way to Washington, D.C., to go to school. However, the State of Texas was kind enough to pay my tuition above the cost had I had stayed here."

During the summers and school breaks, he would return to Houston to work in Riverside General Hospital which, along with St. Elizabeth's Hospital, were the only black hospitals here.

He remembers the trips because the civil rights movement was not even a groundswell at the time, and his journey crossed the deep South. "I drove to and from Hous-

ton," said Coleman. "But I couldn't just drive until I got tired and check into a motel to sleep. I had to drive all night long, to Meridian, Miss., where they had a black motel, or to St. Louis, where there was a black hotel. As a result, I often slept on the side of the road."

Prejudice against blacks was as deeply ingrained in the medical profession as in other social strata. Coleman learned while a medical student. He was the first black to train in obstetrics and gynecology. Even fellow students from the South criticized his decision to return to Houston to practice. "They contended I wouldn't get adequate hospital privileges, and when you specialize as I did, you have to have a hospital," said Coleman.

"None of the men I knew were attracted to Texas because there were no hospital facilities for black doctors. So many of the guys who left here to become doctors chose to practice in New York, California or Detroit."

Coleman interned and took his residency training at the District of Columbia Hospital before returning here in 1962. He found himself barred from all Houston hospitals except Riverside General, St. Elizabeth's and Ben Taub—"Black doctors couldn't join the Harris County Medical Society, which was a prerequisite for gaining hospital privileges." He worked mainly in Riverside General, rising to become chief of staff of the hospital, and is still associated with it.

Today he is a member of not only the HCMS but the Houston Medical Forum and the Texas, National and American Medical Associations and practices in St. Joseph's Hospital. While he came back to Houston to minister largely to the black community, Coleman has a number of whites as well as other ethnic minority members among his patients.

Despite his affluence and influence, Coleman does not see himself as a self-made success. Many people, his parents foremost, helped shape his life, he said. He credits a core of determined, dedicated ministers, educators and other leaders of Houston's black community as his guides and mentors during his formative years. "Otherwise, I might just have easily ended up in prison," he said.

"The educators were great. They inspired young blacks to keep trying, to prepare ourselves so we would have a better way of life. We called our principals 'Professor,' and our teachers became our role models. Of course, we didn't always understand what they were doing for us. I had one physics teacher who constantly chastised me, even if I was just standing talking to another student, for wasting my time. I felt he was picking on me."

"Only after I went to Fisk, became the highest ranking student in my class and won a scholarship, did I realize he'd been preparing me for the days ahead. Because I went there frightened. I'd been told that blacks in Houston didn't have the college preparatory education afforded blacks in Chicago, Detroit, New York and other places, and Fisk had students from all over the world. I was afraid I wouldn't be admitted."

"Actually, as I learned, Houston blacks received better educations in high school than blacks in other large cities. But the rumor at the time held that Southern blacks were inferior to Northern blacks, even Western blacks, and if you were from the South, you were the low man on the totem pole, even among the black community."

"But I was successful at Fisk because my high school teachers cared and because they wanted to make sure I realized my potential."

He was one of the quiet black leaders, after he returned here, who did the most to change the status of Houston blacks, opening up hotels, restaurants and theaters to blacks and otherwise tearing down racial barriers. He turned his energies and efforts to educational projects about the same time.

"I was involved in a number of things shortly after I returned, activist and social organizations," said Coleman. "But I wasn't sure, after evaluating the time, energy and money spent, of the value of the things we were doing. I came to the conclusion we weren't doing what we were capable of doing. I decided to devote my time to something where I would know my efforts were worthwhile and my money was well spent, and I became involved in education."

He is satisfied with the progress blacks have made here in the past 15 years but feels there is much still to be accomplished. "The basic improvement I have seen is the number of blacks and other underprivileged people, for that matter, who are now availing themselves of an education," he said, "and I've seen an improvement in the number of people, black and white, who are willing to give these youngsters a chance. However, far too few fall in the latter category."

"But the number of black youngsters graduating from high school and who have the opportunity to prepare themselves to enter the mainstream of life has definitely increased."

"Similarly, I see black people making a meaningful impact in all phases of the political spectrum, and I feel because of this, people in all segments of the community—black, brown or white—are getting a bigger slice of the pie."

While civil rights laws and a shifting of public attitudes toward tolerance are major factors in achieving more equal status for blacks, interaction of the races has had a positive effect, said Coleman. "I think that people getting to know one another is what it's all about. That's the first step in solving their problems, better understanding both their differences and their similarities. Whites forget they're whites, and blacks forget they're blacks, and instead they concentrate on the goals they both want to achieve. You see it regularly in the job market now. Blacks and whites get to know each other on a one-to-one basis, and they become friends forever."

Thursday in the Shamrock Hilton Hotel a \$100-a-plate dinner, staged by the Fisk University Alumni Club here, will honor Dr. Coleman, proceeds going to the United Negro College Fund.

In an age of equal opportunity, Negro colleges would seem to be an anomaly. There will come a time in the distant future, Coleman feels, when black colleges will cease to be as such and simply exist as universities.

"It has been said for years that we want integration (of schools), and this is true, but we also want options, and we don't want total obliteration," said Coleman. "I feel my children were better off going to a black college initially, because they received the psychological nurturing that they would not have gotten in a larger school where they were just a number, a textbook and an assignment."

"Right now, over 75 percent of our M.D.s, over 50 percent of our Ph.D.s and over 50 percent of our elected black officials came

from these small colleges. They went to a major college afterward but went first to a black college. Many of us needed the transitional period, the psychological nurturing, that a black college afforded before we entered the mainstream."

"There will always be a need for colleges where people find themselves more comfortable with their surroundings than they would in others. No matter how we'd like it to be, that's the way it is, I hope the day will come when we have just one school, but it's not here yet."

He still has fears. "I fear that the strides we have made may be eroded with the economy as it stands today," he said. "I fear that those people (politicians) who were the losers, as it were, will turn to attempting to persecute, harass and intimidate the weakest among us, which are usually the minorities. You can see a trend toward conservatism, which isn't all bad, but along with that goes a right-wing element who are haters as opposed to the good, decent people we have become accustomed to in the past 10 years. I really fear the recurrence of haters in our community."

"I feel if the decent people who have helped to make the strides we have made remain silent, this trend will continue. I think it can be headed off, but only if the people who believe in what is right and decent will step forward and let the haters know that the decent segment of society doesn't like it and won't let it happen."

There are many thousands of John Coleman's friends who say they won't let that happen here. The people behind the dinner honoring him say that he has built too much that's good for it to be torn down.

Willie Alexander, a Houston insurance man and former star football player with the professional Houston Oilers, summed up John Coleman:

"He's an inspiration to all mankind." ●

TRIBUTE TO DUNCAN J. SINCLAIR, JR.

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the January 1, 1982, copy of the Laurinburg Exchange in Laurinburg, N.C.

Duncan Sinclair has not only been a good friend to me but also to the many people he has served so unselfishly in Scotland County. Through his charitable work in the county, he has given hope and meaning to the life of many people. His dedicated efforts through his service on the Scotland Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees has brought Scotland County the best in medical facilities and personnel.

He has devoted a great deal of his time to the youth in his area which is exemplified through his work with Boy Scouts.

Dunc is a man of great compassion and integrity. It is quite refreshing to me to know a man who is willing to sacrifice his time for others and expect absolutely nothing in return.

The article follows:

TO SINCLAIR, GIVING IS BETTER THAN RECEIVING

When the Scotland Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees honored their chairman, Duncan J. Sinclair, Jr., by naming the dining room of the new hospital the Sinclair Dining Room last March, Sinclair responded with complete surprise.

Sinclair's reaction indicated the lack of importance that he attaches to personal recognition for himself. For Sinclair, giving has always been more important than getting.

"I'm probably not deserving, but I appreciate the honor," Sinclair said as plans were announced that a permanent plaque bearing his name would be erected in the dining room of the new hospital now under construction.

"Others have done more than I have," he added.

Sinclair's years of service in various areas of community life have been influenced by the "others" he spoke of that evening.

"This county has always been very giving and considerate of the needs of the community. It's people like Edwin Morgan and his son Jimmy, O. L. Moore and Halbert Jones that have influenced me," Sinclair reflected during a recent interview at Sinclair Lumber Co.

"I grew up here and followed in the footsteps of these men," Sinclair said, typically giving credit for his generosity and loyalty to the example of other community leaders.

"This community has been generous to me in a lot of ways, and through the eyes of those older than myself and those I have had a lot of respect for, I saw the benefits of their wisdom and tried to help in a lesser way than they did. I got the feeling that there were needs to be met and that I should help."

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Sinclair has served for 21 years on the hospital's board of trustees. He has served as chairman of the board for the past three years, during a most demanding period of planning for the new facility.

He has provided "outstanding leadership marked by an extraordinary commitment of time and energy, and an unusual degree of wisdom and foresight", according to a resolution established by the hospital board.

Robert R. Martin, in his 15th year as hospital administrator, said Sinclair has shown "a strong and unique leadership style with demands for high performance and positive results. He is a tough taskmaster, yet is fair and supportive in his actions."

Martin added, "His dedication and commitment to the community and hospital are clearly demonstrated by the many long hours he has devoted to assessing needs, evaluating efficiency and effectiveness of hospital operations and planning for new and improved hospital facilities and services."

Scotland Memorial Hospital is one of many phases of community life to which Duncan Sinclair has contributed through his leadership, time and financial support.

Boy Scouting is another major interest of Sinclair, a resident of Azure Court. He became involved in the Boy Scout program about 12 years ago by assisting the scoutmaster with his son's troop.

He is serving his second year as vice president of administration for the Cape Fear Council of Boy Scouts of America, and has served on the board for eight years. In 1979, Sinclair was given the Silver Beaver award

for outstanding volunteer service. The Silver Beaver award is the highest honor given to a volunteer by the council.

Sinclair sees the Boy Scout program as "a movement worthwhile for the youth . . . an improvement for the nation of tomorrow. It's one of the better things a person can be involved in."

Sinclair's major interest being politics, he served as a Laurinburg city councilman for almost 20 years and played a significant role in the establishment of a strong city manager-council type government.

In 1974, he was appointed to the local Department of Social Services board of directors and served diligently until 1980. Upon his retirement, he was honored by the DSS board for his leadership contributions.

He has also been involved in the Chamber of Commerce activities through the years, has served on the Laurinburg-Maxton Airport Commission, and is a deacon in the First Baptist Church.

His friends and associates describe Sinclair as one who wants to receive very little credit for his deeds of goodwill in the community. In fact, it has been downright embarrassing to him to receive such recognition for his contributions, some say.

Jim Milligan, publisher of The Laurinburg Exchange, has served with Sinclair in phases of Chamber work, on the airport commission and on the hospital board.

"He is one of the most unassuming individuals who works for his community that you will ever find. What it does for him always comes last," Milligan said, "He is more concerned for the good of the community than for what it will do for him."

CIVIC MINDED FAMILY

Sinclair's spirit of giving was instilled in him during childhood. He was one of two children born to Mr. and Mrs. Duncan J. Sinclair in the year 1926. His father, in partnership with R. L. McLeod of Maxton in the lumber business, was active in community life and served as mayor of Laurinburg for 12 years, until his death in 1947.

Sinclair described his father as "generous, community minded and a good church member." He credited his mother with "a good business head."

One of his first tasks after his father's death and as a young businessman was raising the money to fulfill a financial commitment his father had made to the hospital just prior to his death.

AN AVERAGE STUDENT

Sinclair's childhood home was on Caledonia Road in the edge of the lumber yard where he build tree houses and "slept out a lot at night". He played neighborhood sports in the middle of the road, with no worry about traffic because of so few automobiles, he remembered.

"We built tunnels and underground hide-aways like they don't have today. And our biggest excitement was going to a western movie for 10 cents and drinking a milkshake afterward."

At Laurinburg schools, he was "an average student," the quiet type.

"I had a little devil in me. I guess. I was no saint. I didn't carve desks, but we threw a few spitballs and put sandspurs in the teachers' desks," he recalled. "At Halloween, we took chairs off people's front porches and put them on top of their house."

Sinclair played tackle on his high school football team. During his junior year, the team won the state championship over Mt. Airy. His favorite subject was math, and "one of my better teachers was Mrs. Aileen

McGill," who taught him algebra in summer school.

In 1944, Sinclair entered Fishburne Military Academy in Waynesboro, Va., and later attended Virginia Military Academy in Lexington, Va. He went into the Army in 1945, serving a year in Italy.

He returned to VMI after his tour of duty, but came home to be with his mother following his father's death. He attended Presbyterian Junior College for a year, then entered Wake Forest University where he earned a degree in business and minored in history.

He became president of Sinclair Lumber Company, which his mother organized in 1948.

In June, 1954, he met Marie Blake, a Lumberton miss who was teaching fourth grade at Covington Street School. They were married a year later.

They are parents of four sons—Jim Sinclair, III, who lives in Raleigh but will join the Sinclair company later this month; William, who works with his father at Sinclair Lumber; David, who is attending Pembroke State University; and John, a student at Woodberry Forest Private School near Orange, Va.

Sinclair's sense of community responsibility has been triggered by his good fortune, a company which has expanded from one to seven locations—Sinclair Lumber, Covington Supply and Economy Building Supply, all in Laurinburg; Economy Building Supply in Fayetteville; Sinclair Lumber Company in Dillon; Carolina Standard in Rockingham; and Scarborough Building Supply in Lumberton. He also owns farm land in Scotland and Robeson counties.

When asked about his secret of success, Sinclair responded, "I have no magic formula I've just been lucky being in the right place at the right time."

"I've been fortunate in having good help and good support from my business people."

BASICALLY A FAMILY MAN

"My wife has been considerate and very patient, but she would probably say I should have been home more," he said. "You can always look around and see things you would have done differently. I have spent a lot of time on community activities that I thought would benefit the family in the long run."

"Basically, I'm the family type." At home, he reads, watches the news on television, sports events, and enjoys exercise.

"There's nothing I like better than sitting down to a coffee table. I enjoy people. I like to be with interesting people and involved in discussion of issues."

"I have gotten a lot of credit for more than I've done. I've just listened to people who spoke of things that needed to be done."

"In the first place, I'm no saint. But my philosophy is that you share with those of lesser means through charitable organizations. There are a lot of good things, but you can't contribute to all of them." ●

PHILADELPHIA CITY COUNCIL URGES PRESIDENT TO MAINTAIN CURRENT HOUSING PROGRAM FUNDING

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in today's RECORD, a copy of Resolution No. 666, adopted by the Philadelphia City Council on January 7, requesting that the President and the U.S. Congress maintain our Federal-assisted housing programs in urban areas at current levels. I think the council's resolution is particularly fitting given the drastic budget reductions proposed for our housing programs by the President yesterday, in his fiscal year 1983 budget.

Mr. Speaker, the housing situation in Philadelphia, and in particular the Second Congressional District which I represent, has reached crisis proportions. Literally thousands of poor and low-income Philadelphia residents are on the waiting lists for public housing. And countless numbers of families are forced to reside in substandard homes, for lack of suitable alternatives. And given this administration's proposed reduction in every facet of our assisted and low-income housing programs, it is imperative that we as Members of Congress meet this problem head on, insuring that adequate housing funds and opportunities exist for our less fortunate citizens. I commend the efforts of the Philadelphia City Council on this issue and urge each of you to consider the resolution carefully.

RESOLUTION No. 666

Whereas, The policy of a decent home in a suitable environment is still federal law; and,

Whereas, Thousands of poor and elderly Philadelphians continue to live in substandard, crowded housing and/or pay an unreasonably high proportion of their incomes for housing; and,

Whereas, Philadelphia and most other areas of our country do not have the resources to deal effectively with problems of poor housing and deteriorating neighborhoods; and,

Whereas, The Office of Management and Budget proposes to end all assisted housing programs (Section 8, public housing and 202 elderly housing) for fiscal 1983 and massively reduce programs such as F.H.A., G.N.M.A. and counseling; and,

Whereas, Such a policy, if adopted, would cause massive suffering to all the people of Philadelphia, but especially the elderly, minorities and low-income people; Now therefore:

Resolved, by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, That the City Council of the City of Philadelphia strongly urges President Ronald Reagan and the United States Congress not to reduce these desperately needed programs in urban areas.

Further Resolved, by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, That a copy of this

Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Philadelphia delegation to the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senators representing Pennsylvania.●

OKLAHOMA'S EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has had to vote today on legislation to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the federally funded State employment services. I think we all can see the fallacy in cutting the lone Federal program that finds jobs when our economy is sinking deeper into a recession and unemployment is rising. But I want to emphasize Oklahoma's particular experience in relation to this cut to drive home the importance of our action.

Oklahoma presently enjoys one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country. Its economy is relatively healthy. However, beneath the surface is an active State employment service that helped place 172,000 Oklahomans, 12.2 percent of the working population, in new jobs last year. It has placed over 10 percent each of the past 20 years.

When the effect of the continuing appropriation cut reached Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission found it necessary to plan to close 14 of the State's 44 field offices and to terminate 322 of the agency's 600 field employees. A rural State like mine depends on extensive field networks to bring services to the people, and the closing of field offices, in some instances, stranded significant numbers of citizens 50 or more miles from the nearest office.

Moreover, small businesses in some smaller Oklahoma communities rely heavily on the employment service to assist them, and losing a field office could severely undercut the small businesses as well as the overall community. Oklahoma's low unemployment rate obscures the fact that some pockets of relatively high unemployment exist—many in my district—and these areas need these services.

As a result, it has been necessary for us to enact an urgent supplemental appropriation to forestall these consequences in Oklahoma and similar and worse consequences in other States.

A lesson is learned, Mr. Speaker. The reckless and irresponsible budget cutting that I expressed concern over last year has come home to haunt us. I reiterate the comments I made then: We have to carefully weigh the pros and cons of each budget cut and ana-

lyze its impact before we enact it, or else we are falling short of our responsibilities to the American people.●

HOME EQUITY CONVERSION FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1982

● Mrs. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, there are probably few statements that I could make with which every Member of this Congress would agree. I am certain, however, that I can confidently say that each and every one of us shares a deep concern with the problems faced by our Nation's elderly. In my own State of Maine, 28 percent of the elderly fall below the poverty level. Many more with fixed incomes are experiencing increasing difficulty in meeting their subsistence needs including health care, home maintenance and taxes in today's world of inflation and increased longevity.

Seventy percent of Maine's elderly own their homes. Ironically while inflation makes older people less able to meet their expenses and retain upkeep of their homes, it is at the same time making them richer by boosting the value of the very home they are having trouble supporting. In short, the old are becoming "asset rich" and "income poor."

In the State of Maine, plans are underway for an innovative program to offer alternatives to these elderly, including the option to "cash-in" the values of their homes while retaining residency and receiving income to meet expenses. Another alternative would allow large, old energy inefficient single-family homes to be renovated or converted into group or shared homes in which several elderly would come together and share skills and resources. This home equity conversion program, cosponsored by the Bureau of Maine's Elderly, the Maine State Housing Authority, the Maine Savings Bank and the University of Maine School of Law, plans to offer home equity options to Maine's elderly through public education, counseling, training, and estate planning services. Importantly, this project recognizes the diversity of the elderly and will make available a range of conversion options for low income to upper income, urban and rural elderly through a partnership between the public and private sectors.

I am very excited about this project. Further, I believe that what is being attempted in Maine will be of interest to people across the country. For this reason, I have included portions of the pregrant application drafted by Maine's Bureau of the Elderly into the Extensions of Remarks. The problems

faced by our Nation's elderly are complex and varied; innovative approaches on the State and local level, such as Maine's home equity conversion project, deserve our support.

A MODEL FOR INNOVATIVE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION THROUGH LINKAGES BETWEEN THE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS

The Bureau of Maine's Elderly, the Maine State Housing Authority, the Maine Savings Bank and the University of Maine School of Law are cosponsoring an application for discretionary funds to address the needs of elderly homeowners through an innovative home equity conversion program.

Home equity conversion can reduce the need for social services and help maintain dignity and independence. However, home equity conversion is a complex concept and tends to benefit only a limited group of elderly. This project aims to develop creative home equity conversion plans which will, for the first time, assist not only middle income people and prevent their pauperization and loss of independence but also help elderly in greatest social or economic need who are the priority of the Older American Act. As the administration and Congress consider different approaches to Federal subsidization of housing, States need to develop methods to create housing alternatives which are cost effective and do not rely solely on Federal programs. We propose a feasibility study to determine ways to maximize privately financed home equity conversion programs and to develop two demonstration projects which reduce reliance on Federal dollars by packaging group and shared homes which require, at best, a minimal investment of tax dollars.

Priority Area 6.2 of the DHHS Discretionary Funds Grant Program stresses the need for improved liaisons between the public and private sectors in the delivery of human services and in the transition from reliance on Federal funding to alternative sources. Home equity conversion increases elderly homeowners' incomes through liquidation of the home asset rather than through reliance on public subsidies. This project will also provide financial and estate planning services through the private sector. Training about home equity conversion will be offered to service providers, volunteer counselors, estate planners and potential suppliers and will emphasize the voluntary contribution of counseling time to the elderly.

C. APPROACH

Home equity conversion is not a new concept. The Home Equity Conversion Project sponsored by the Wisconsin Bureau of Aging serves as a clearinghouse for new ideas and developments in the field. The project's goal is to promote a variety of home equity conversion plans through research and policy recommendations. Through its efforts a property tax deferral bill has been passed, but to date there is no specific product. However, several plans are currently being developed nationwide. Private non-profit agencies in Wisconsin are making deferred payment loans. A private realty company in California is developing sale leaseback plans. The Buffalo HELP program encourages non-profit agencies to purchase remainder interests in old persons' homes in exchange for the payment of property taxes, major repairs and a lifetime annuity. A neighborhood association in Milwaukee is attempting to conserve local housing stock through a reverse mortgage/purchase option instrument. The San Francisco

Development Fund provides referrals for existing home equity conversion plans—particularly reverse annuity mortgages—and also conducts outreach. While plans spring up across the country one point has become clear—home equity conversion plans are as various as individual needs require and should be individually structured.

In Maine, Deering Savings and Loan of Portland offered the first reverse mortgage in the United States but has now suspended this lending activity due to high interest rates and the large amount of counseling time involved. The 1980 Blaine House Conference on Aging directed the Bureau of Maine's Elderly and the Maine State Housing Authority to conduct a study concerning the options regarding home equity conversion. The 1981 Blaine House Conference on Aging resolved that the Maine legislature create a property tax postponement program by 1983.

In October, 1981, the Bureau of Maine's Elderly and the Maine State Housing Authority sent an informational paper and questionnaire about home equity conversion to potential suppliers of such plans. Respondents included insurance associations, area agencies on aging, housing development corporations, community action programs, realtors, housing authorities, bankers, credit unions, investment advisory services and mortgage companies. The overall response rate to the written questionnaire was 32 percent. 91 percent of the respondents felt there may be a need for home equity conversion devices in Maine. 55 percent would definitely consider participating in home equity conversion plans. While 24 percent were uncertain about and 21 percent would not consider participating in such plans, 62 percent of the respondents thought a survey of elderly homeowner interest might increase the likelihood of their participation. 64 percent said the State should develop information and technical assistance to distribute to suppliers to inform them about home equity conversion. 85 percent of the respondents were interested in learning more about at least one of the home equity conversion plans described in the paper.

Based on this survey, there is a strong community based interest in and support for the development of home equity conversion plans. Members of most groups surveyed offered assistance in the development of a statewide home equity conversion program. In order to mobilize this support, a home equity conversion task force composed of representatives from the groups surveyed will be organized to develop a variety of home equity conversion plans which link the public and private sectors and to guide this project. The Director of the Bureau of Maine's Elderly will chair this task force. Such plans will originate primarily in the private sector and will be geared toward moderate and low income elderly homeowners.

In conjunction with task force efforts, the Maine State Housing Authority will conduct a feasibility study funded by grant money. The study will focus on alternative financing, development, and sponsorship methods (tax exempt, Section 202, Community Development Block Grant, FmHA 515: sale/leaseback conversion to rental or group housing, etc.) and will analyze which options produce the greatest rates of return for the elderly homeowner. The study will research what development and financing

alternatives are necessary to produce shared or group housing affordable by very low income elderly and competitive in the local private marketplace. Legal, market, architectural design, operating and cost issues will be addressed coterminously with the planning of group and shared home demonstration projects. The feasibility study will also include a statewide survey to determine the value of elderly homeowners' property and their interest in home equity conversion. This market survey will include questions about interest in shared and group home programs in addition to home equity conversion. Thus data vital to three different programs will be derived from the survey, which will be conducted by a qualified survey research organization.

Two demonstration plans for low income elderly homeowners who live in large, deteriorating, inefficient, single-family homes will be developed through this project. The first plan will incorporate a shared housing program into a home equity conversion loan plan. Through shared housing, elderly persons combine their efforts and resources to operate a single family household. Shared housing is geared toward higher functioning elderly people who are both able and willing to engage in communal living arrangements. The second plan will combine a group home program with a home equity conversion sale form. Group homes are community residences for a small number of elderly clients who require a supportive living environment. While group homes for well elderly may be rooted in the philosophy of family-like living, small congregate living arrangements for the frail elderly could also be considered group homes. These demonstration plans, started up by project funds will become self-supporting through repayment of loans and acquisition of housing stock.

The first plan will be implemented by Central Senior Citizens Association, an area agency on aging which covers the rural six county area from the coast to the western mountains of Knox, Lincoln, Waldo, Sagadahoc, Kennebec and Somerset. The agency will offer loans secured by home equity to owners of shared homes for rehabilitation, payment of taxes, major repairs or simply cash flow. Since household expenses will be shared, interest and principal payments should be easily met. These payments will create a fund through which loan money will continuously revolve to assist additional homeowners. While interest rates for this plan will depend on need and income levels, banks could also offer loans modeled after this demonstration plan at competitive interest rates. Central Senior Citizens Association will match shared housing mates for compatibility, oversee the initial living arrangements and provide continuing social services as needed.

The second plan will be conducted through Southern Maine Senior Citizens, Inc., the area agency on aging which serves Cumberland and York Counties. Under this plan, a homeowner will sell his home to the area agency and retain a life interest in an individual living unit. The agency may use moderate rehabilitation money to convert the home into a group home. The area agency will develop a services program for the group home, which will be akin to a small congregate living facility. The elderly "seller" will be able to live in his unit at no cost and with all taxes, major repairs, and insurance paid for by the area agency. The seller will receive an initial lump sum based

on the value of the house and his life expectancy and could also receive a lifetime stipend. Through this sale procedure, housing stock will be purchased at very little initial cost. Cooperative forms of homeownership for group home residents could be used to render the program self-supporting from the start.

Grant money will also be used to fund a system designed to help elderly homeowners choose ways to use home equity to its maximum benefit. The first component of such a system will be educating elderly homeowners about home equity conversion through financial planning seminars sponsored by the Maine Savings Bank and conducted by professional estate planners. Informing older people about resources and how to apply for home equity conversion plans will also be achieved through a "Consumer's Self-Help Guide to Home Equity Conversion", jointly written by the Bureau of Maine's Elderly and the Maine Savings Bank. The system's second component will be an education and training program for service providers and potential suppliers of home equity conversion plans, which will be structured by the Maine Savings Bank and sponsored by the Home Equity Conversion Task Force. These workshops will train people such as loan officers to help elderly people interested in home equity conversion to identify issues prior to referring them to various home equity conversion programs or to estate planners for further advice. Members of volunteer organizations such as the Senior Citizens Organization of Retired Executives (SCORE) will be invited to learn about home equity conversion for counseling and referral purposes.

The final component of this system will be an estate planning program sponsored by the University of Maine School of Law. A part-time estate planner will work with two part-time research assistants to develop an estate planning referral system to the private bar and a clinical law program through which referrals could be handled by law students with attorney supervision. The Law School will recruit two law students to serve as research assistants to the estate planner, who will probably be a law professor. The estate planning staff, while advising elderly homeowners who are considering selling their homes, will develop a purchase and sale contract form for sales of homes to family members in return for lifetime care and maintenance. They will research how older people can best enjoy an improved standard of living now while still providing for relatives after death. Standard legal forms and technical assistance will be made available to lawyers participating in the referral system so that legal time is reduced and estate planning can be made more accessible to elderly people. Through the investment made by this project in a clinical law course, we hope to demonstrate the value of this program for full time inclusion in the Law School curriculum.

A state coordinator located at the Bureau of Maine's Elderly will be hired to facilitate implementation of the home equity conversion project described in this proposal. Particular emphasis will be placed on coordinating efforts between the private and public sectors in the development and dissemination of home equity conversion plans and providing necessary staffing to the home equity conversion task force. ●